INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 9.] (NEW SERIES.) SEPTEMBER, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	257
The Alibag Revision Settlement, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	262
The Administration of Justice in India, by J. Dacosta ..	263
Indian Railway Exploitation	264
Lord Wolseley and the British and Indian Armies ..	266
An Opportunity for Revision, by A. Nundy	268
The "Budget" Debate: Opinions of the Press ..	270
Lord G. Hamilton's Optimism	273
Wanted: Effective Scrutiny	274
Wordsworth: His Present and Future Influence ..	276
Râja Yoga	278
Our London Letter	279
Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee	280
The "Budget" Debate: Official Record	281
Lord Welby's Commission: Evidence of Lord Wolseley and Lord Cromer	282
Reviews: A Social Reformer	284
The Karakoram Himalayas	286
"Om!"	286
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects ..	288
Recent Official Publications	288

Indiana.

The Budget and the Queen's Speech. IN spite of all requests and remonstrances, the "strongest Government of modern times" limited the debate on the Indian Budget to a single day, and that the last day but one of the Session. We discuss elsewhere the leading features of the debate, and it is not necessary to recall here the criticisms on the Financial Statement which have already appeared in our columns.[1] Lord George Hamilton, reversing the usual procedure, made his statement before the Speaker left the chair. His admitted purpose was to curtail discussion on the amendments, which he described as "purely academic in character." He made no reference to the charge for the Indian force at Suakin, but the frequent passages in which both he and Sir Henry Fowler dwelt upon the wisdom and authority of the Government of India supplied a rather ironical commentary upon that "masterpiece of melancholy meanness." In this connexion, it is interesting to note that the Queen's Speech on the prorogation of Parliament supplied a revised theory of the Sudan expedition, which, however, contained no mention of Indian interests:—

"The hostile movements of the Dervish forces in Egypt along the Valley of the Nile, and against the positions in the occupation of Italy to the east of that river, convinced me that it had become necessary for the Egyptian Government to take steps for arresting their advance.

"By my advice, therefore, and under my sanction, an expedition has been undertaken for the purpose of restoring to the Government of the Khedive, as far as Dongola, the territory which was lost to Egypt ten years ago. The operations are still proceeding, but, by a short and brilliant action at Ferkeh, a considerable proportion of the territory indicated has already been recovered."

In a later paragraph, however, the Queen's Speech referred to India as follows:—

"The peaceful delimitation of the North-Western frontier has proceeded, and further agreements have been made with the Shah of Persia and the Amír of Afghanistan, fixing their territorial limits. Friendly relations have been maintained with the tribes on the road to Chitral and the relief of the garrisons in that country has been effected without difficulty, and with the cordial co-operation of tribesmen in the neighbourhood."

"Peaceful" in this context is rather good. The last sentence should be contrasted with Lord G. Hamilton's speech of August 13th on the Indian Budget, and compared with his speech of February 17th, on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address. On August 13th Lord G. Hamilton said:—

"I am glad to say the relations between our officers and troops and the tribes are steadily improving."

But on February 17th he had said:—

"There has been a difference between the Indian Government and the tribes as regards the Proclamation, but only in one sense. The heads of the tribes petitioned the Political Officer asking to be incorporated in British territory.

[1] See pp. 97, 98; 129-132; 134, 135; 141-144; 167, 168, etc., etc.

(Laughter and cheers.) They said they had felt such advantage and security from the presence of the troops" etc., etc.

This confusion of tongues is interesting, but rather embarrassing. In February the only difficulty with the tribes on the road to Chitral arises from their excessive friendliness towards us. Nevertheless, on August 13th we are told that our relations with them are "steadily improving." On the following day we learn that "friendly relations have been maintained." Perhaps what Lord George Hamilton means is that the tribes are gradually getting over their annoyance at the refusal of their request for incorporation in British territory.

Mutual Admiration.

IT may be doubted whether compliments and congratulations across the Table have ever before reached the sublime, or ridiculous, height attained by Sir Henry Fowler in the Budget debate. He and Lord George Hamilton, it would seem, have formed a Mutual Admiration Society. We cull at random a few specimens of Sir H Fowler's flowers of oratory :—

"He had to congratulate the noble lord on the satisfactory statement he had made to the House."

"He would not say that he entertained any feeling of envy towards him . . . . but at all events he could not help looking with some feeling of jealous pleasure at the statement the noble lord had been able to make."

"He had always maintained, as the noble lord had done on that occasion, that the true secret of our financial difficulties in India was the difficulty of exchange."

"He had been much gratified to hear that the frontier difficulties were coming to an end."

"The subject in which he took the greatest interest when he was in office was that of the extension of railways in India, and he was very pleased to note the advance which the noble lord had made in this work during the present year."

"He hoped the noble lord would continue to pursue this policy, and in doing so he would confer a great boon on the people of India."

And so forth, and so on. Can we wonder that, at the end of it all, the noble lord was able to say that "the general discussion had been so friendly that he had very little to answer"? Yet Lord George Hamilton had positively reversed Sir Henry Fowler's policy in the two important matters of Chitral and the cotton duties! On the latter subject, indeed, Sir H. Fowler did venture to say a few words. But he defended himself so mildly, and criticised his successor so slightly, that Lord G. Hamilton did not deem the speech worthy of a reply. And the really astounding thing is that Sir H. Fowler, as his speech showed, is substantially in agreement with the contentions urged, and the readjustment proposed, by S. W. Wedderburn in his speech of May 18th, which Si. H. Fowler so hotly condemned. As for Sir H. Fowler's comparisons of taxation in India and England, and in Madras and Mysore, they have been exploded so often that they can no longer attract serious notice.

Judicial and Executive Functions.

ONE of the many important subjects which were brought forward in the debate on the Indian Budget is the union of judicial and executive functions in the same officer in India. The Indian National Congress from the time of its foundation has not ceased to call attention to this indefensible combination of duties, and the dangers which are inseparable from it. The subject has, as our readers are aware, been conspicuous for a long time in our columns, and in July last we announced that an important Memorial would shortly be presented to the Secretary of State praying for the separation of the duties of judge from the duties of public prosecutor. The presentation of the Memorial has, we regret to say, been unavoidably postponed for the moment on account of delay in the transit of some important documents from India. The matter is, however, engaging the active attention of the British Committee, and the Memorial will, at the first convenient opportunity, be laid before Lord George Hamilton by a representative deputation of jurists, members of Parliament, and others interested in the question. It is worth noting that Lord George Hamilton, in his brief reply on the Budget debate, described the question as "complicated but important," and added that :—

"The Indian Government were giving great attention to it. The change urged would involved great expenditure, but gradually the Indian Government were working in that direction."

This is a not unsatisfactory statement, if we except the inevitable reference to expenditure. Lord G. Hamilton knows perfectly well that, according to Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and other experts who have examined the question, the desired change could be brought about without any considerable expense. That is the view of authorities like Sir Richard Garth and Mr. Manomohan Ghose. Mr. Ghose has devoted himself with exemplary vigour to advocacy of the reform, and his two recent and exceedingly valuable pamphlets on the subject are discussed by Mr. Dacosta on another page. We may add that copies of the Memorandum on judicial and executive functions which was circulated by the British Committee last spring, were again distributed to members of the House of Commons in anticipation of the recent Budget debate. It is to be regretted that Sir W. Wedderburn was precluded by the forms of the House from speaking on the subject. Having moved an amendment himself, he had spoken on the main question, and was debarred from speaking again until the motion to go into Committee had been agreed to.

The Candour of the *Englishman.* IN this connexion, we may express the hope that Lord George Hamilton has seen, or will see, an article printed in the *Englishman* of July 28th under the title, "Mr. Ghose and the Magistracy." The *Englishman* not only professes to be, but is, the chief exponent in India of the opinions and prejudices of the Civil Service, and the noteworthy feature of its article, which purports to be a review of Mr. Ghose's pamphlets, is that it frankly acknowledges the "prestige" argument—as opposed to the "great expenditure" argument—to be the basis of the opposition to reform. The *Englishman* refers in terms of scornful amusement to Mr. Ghose's remarks upon the "prestige" argument, as being put forward chiefly in confidential communications :—

"Mr. Ghose is quite shocked at this illustration of official secretiveness, which he seems to base upon the fact that during the debate on the well-known Maimansingh case in the House of Lords in 1893 Lord Kimberley, the then Secretary of State for India, took occasion to contradict a statement to that effect, which had been made by Sir Richard Garth, and to decline to admit in any way that the union of the two powers was maintained in India for any such purpose. We had given Mr. Ghose credit for being too old a bird to be caught with such chaff. To the man in the street Secretaries of State for India are objects more of sorrow than of anger. Their knowledge of the country and its requirements is so infinitesimal that it is impossible to take them seriously; and we must do them the justice to say that it is only the young and more rash among them who, like the present occupant of the office, demand to be accepted as authorities on Indian topics. There is a lamentable partiality for platitudes, which seems to be a hereditary attribute of the Secretary of State for India; and we must confess it is with some surprise that we find Mr. Ghose attaching such profound importance to these well-sounding periods of Lord Kimberley's. Nor do we understand how Mr. Ghose should have persuaded himself that this question of prestige has been sedulously kept in the background. It is far from being a skeleton in the official cupboard."

The *Englishman* proceeds to refer to the opinions of Lord Ulick Browne, Mr. Henry Bell, and Sir James Westland, and to declare in so many words that the "prestige" argument is "the great argument in favour of the retention of the present system." As for the doctrine that one and the same officer ought not to be both thief-catcher and magistrate, public prosecutor and Judge, superintendent of police and Judge in appeal, the *Englishman* dismisses it as "the hidebound and narrow notion" of lawyers. In other words, the contention put forward at the instance of the India Office by Lord Kimberley in the House of Lords, and by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons, is, according to the *Englishman*, so much nonsense put into the mouths of Secretaries of State for the express purpose of misleading Parliament. Whether this remarkable article in the *Englishman* has been written or inspired by Sir James Westland himself, we do not know. But it is a significant and valuable proof of the proposition, consistently urged by the advocates of separation, that the alleged difficulty of expense is a mere pretext, and that the real objection to reform lies in the determination of District Magistrates to keep themselves invested with despotic powers. The candour of the *Englishman* tends to clear the air. It shows precisely the point against which our attack must be directed, and it ought to put Lord George Hamilton on his guard against the departmental reports which, in due course, he will receive from India. Having the *Englishman's* article before him, he can no longer treat seriously the bogey of expenditure. On the contrary, it becomes a question for him how far it is consistent with his dignity to allow dust to be thrown in his eyes by the Indian Civil Service. Sir Charles Elliott does not disguise the fact that his views are entirely in accordance with the views of Sir James Westland, and the opinion of Sir Alexander Mackenzie, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, is known to be the same.

Exchange Compensation Allowance. THE charge for Exchange Compensation Allowance seems to have become an established burden of Rx. 1,000,000 to Rx. 1,500,000 upon the sorely taxed people of India. Since the allowance was first made in 1893 a bonus of over three crores of rupees has been added to the handsome salaries of Indian Civil Servants, with a further prospective donation of nearly a crore and a quarter for the current financial year. Now we have never objected to reasonable compensation in cases of proved hardship. What we have all along protested against, and what we shall continue to protest against, is the unjust and indiscriminate award of this exchange compensa ion. It may be right and proper, and in the interests of good government, that a civil servant who came out to India twenty years ago, when the rupee was nearly at par, should be compensated by Government for the fall in exchange which has nearly halved his salary. But it is wholly unjust and inexpedient to treat in the same way the officer who joined the Service a few years ago, when exchange was already below 1s. 6d., and when its probable further fall was a matter so notorious that no reasonable man in entering the Indian Civil Service could fail to have appreciated the risk and to have counted the cost. It is eminently desirable that Government should treat its servants well. It is quite unnecessary that the salaries of all Government servants should be increased promiscuously, because the salaries of some have suffered an unlooked-for reduction through the accidents of international finance.

Facts and Figures. A WELL-INFORMED correspondent in Lucknow has furnished us with some remarkable figures in relation to this question, which throw considerable light on the

hollow plea of financial distress among the ruling caste in India. Is it necessary to remind our readers that these very words, "financial distress," were frequently on the lips of the advocates of exchange compensation when it was first granted? Taking the salaries of the civilians in the North-West Provinces and Oudh of two to twenty-two years standing, our correspondent shows that officers up to fifteen or sixteen years' service so far from losing anything by the depreciation in exchange gain enormously. The reason is that men are beginning to retire from the service as soon as they can, which naturally quickens promotion with increased pay for junior men. He pertinently adds: "If compensation allowance is to be given at all it surely should be given to men who have lost by the fall in exchange rather than to those who have gained so greatly." Thus the average monthly salary in rupees of civilians from two to seven years standing has gradually risen from Rs. 581 in 1875 to Rs. 852 in 1895; while the average yearly salary in sterling, despite the heavy fall in exchange and without compensation, has fallen only from £639 in 1875 to £564 in 1895. For officers of eight to twelve years' standing the figures are: 1875, Rs. 959 per mensem, or £945 per annum; 1895, Rs. 1,302 per mensem, or £863 per annum. For officers of thirteen to seventeen years' standing the average salary was in 1875 Rs. 1,121 per mensem, or £1,233 per annum; and in 1895, Rs. 1,813 per mensem, or £1,201 per annum. Now, when it is borne in mind that in any case a large portion of an officer's salary must be spent in India, the enormous increase in the average rupee salaries of civilians from two to seventeen years standing, coupled with the very small decline which, owing to this increase, is shown in their yearly salaries converted into pounds sterling, bears striking testimony to the hasty and inequitable manner in which compensation has been granted. On the other hand, the salaries of officers from eighteen to twenty-two years standing, where the quickening of promotion ceases to operate, have been seriously affected by the fall in exchange. While their average rupee salary has remained practically the same, its sterling equivalent has fallen from £2,404 in 1875 to £1,374 in 1895. Here, then, was a legitimate field for fair compensation.

Compensation an increase of Salary.

But this so-called compensation in the case of officers from 2 to 17 years' standing is, under the circumstances, nothing more nor less than an increase of salary. Taking the average salaries of Indian civilians in the North-West Provinces and converting them into pounds sterling, half at the rate of exchange for the year and the other half at the rate granted by way of compensation, we arrive at the following startling results:—

Officers.	1875.	1895.	Increase of Average Salary.
From 2 to 7 years' standing	£639	£793	£154
,, 8 to 12 ,, ,,	£945	£1,212	£267
,, 13 to 17 ,, ,,	£1,233	£1,688	£455

It is only when we look into the salaries of officers from 18 to 22 years' standing that we find, in spite of compensation, a serious fall in value, the average incomes of these civilians having fallen from £2,404 to £1,841. It may be well to mention that the figures have been compiled from the Civil List for January in each year (men on furlough and serving under other Governments being omitted). In January there are fewer men on furlough than at any other time of the year; while for at least six months in the year the junior men are as a body drawing much higher pay than that upon which the foregoing calculations have been based. Surely facts such as these justify the continuing resentment of the Indian public at the unjust way in which exchange compensation has been awarded to the Indian Civil Service.

British Officers with Indian Regiments.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes:—"General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, in the course of his rattling speech on the Indian Budget night, started a fine 'old hare'—the paucity of British officers with the native regiments of the Indian armies. He made his run gallantly, and one cannot attempt here to follow him over his cross-country course; but, rash though it may seem, it will do no harm to try to break or divert the scent. The Gener l admitted that when on active service several extra British officers are usually added to the fixed number of eight to the regiment, and, as will be seen from Lord George Hamilton's answer to Sir W. Wedderburn's question, earlier in the evening, as to the sanitary condition of the Indian contingent now at Suakin and Tokar, there are in those places seventy European officers—nearly double the number which would normally belong to five native Indian regiments. I am quite aware that this is not a full answer to the gallant member's contention; but I cannot follow that up here. What is necessary to be pointed out—for it is constantly disregarded by those who raise this perennial contention—is that all mention was omitted by Sir Henry of the native Indian *commissioned* officers, the subedars and jemadars (answering to our majors and captains), some twelve to sixteen of whom always form part of each Indian regiment. Mention of this fact puts a very different complexion on the present organisation of the native Indian armies. Though this explanation may not serve to satisfy the critics of the system—which has

now subsisted for nearly thirty years—that organisation was the result of long and anxious consideration by competent military authorities, whose judgment is entitled to at least as much weight as that of any British officer, however gallant and experienced in their periods of Indian service, as is Sir Henry. For instance, the present writer has heard the late Lord Napier of Magdala vindicate this regimental organisation, and not least so on the ground of his well-tried confidence in the modern order of native commissioned officers. 'Robert Napier of the Engineers,' who, though a man of few words, was a thoughtful statesman as well as a soldier, had full experience of the old order in the Sepoy regiments, and he assisted at every step in the modern reorganisation of the Indian native armies since the break-up of the old system at the great revolt. At that time the regular establishment of the two-battalion regiments comprised some forty-five British officers, and we know, too well, how signally that system broke down under the strain of disaffection and mutiny. So that the chronic cry for increase of British officers with Indian Sepoy regiments is not quite so forcible as one might suppose whilst listening to General Havelock-Allan's speech the other night.

The History of the Question.

"The subject is one full of historical, and, in the proper sense, political interest — to say nothing of financial considerations which must be taken into account. As to the history of the question, I have heard Lord Napier of Magdala say that the above-named large proportion of British officers assigned to the Indian armies was forced on by peremptory orders from the War Office or the Horse Guards in the early part of the present century, and in defiance of strong remonstrances on the part of the Indian Government of that day. Whether the remorseless, horse-leech craving for patronage and promotion had much to do with these ancient 'orders from home,' it would be too curious to enquire now. As partly dealing with the history of this semi-technical question of organisation one may usefully refer to a recent leader in the *Times of India* (Summary, June 12th). The writer is too well informed to 'ignore the subedars and jemadars of our Indian Army.' He says frankly and justly: 'They are an admirable body of men, loyal to the Government they serve, devoted to their regiments and to their duty, brave and zealous. But they are not [individually] the equals of the British officers'—which, as my interpolation indicates, is not the question at issue. Here it may be remarked, in passing, that there is much in the Bombay journalist's article, two months ago, which might have served to answer beforehand Lord Wolseley's unhappy ebullition before the Royal Commission, which, by this time, probably, no one regrets more than does 'Our Only General' himself. One word as to Sir H. Havelock-Allan's illustration drawn from the catastrophe at Maiwand. It may be the fact (though I doubt it) that 'there were only ten British officers between the native regiments engaged.' But, if so, someone at headquarters had 'blundered.' And, at most, that was only one incident in a great disaster for which, so far as I remember, the Intelligence Department or the political officers concerned were chiefly at fault. Though present at the court-martial held on two of the surviving regimental officers, I do not recall that much, if any, stress was laid on that particular defect in organisation."

"Flotsam."

It would appear that Mr. H. Seton Merriman gave the title "Flotsam" to his book (Longmans & Co.) either under a misapprehension as to the exact meaning of the term, or with a wholly wrong valuation of the character of his hero. Jetsam would be more appropriate. Harry Wylam is a ponderous individual who spends most of his existence in sinking, and ends with the rest of the characters in a picturesque confusion aptly typified by the vignette on the title-page of the book. The story is overweighted, too, by morals. The Duchess propounded to Alice the valuable theory that everything has a moral, and emphasized her opinion with unpleasant persistency. Mr. Merriman does the emphasizing, although he does not avow his principle so unblushingly as the Duchess did. We are not allowed to find out for ourselves what the bearing upon our lives of the history written for our instruction may be. We have special warnings on almost every page, which guide our feet into the way of that peace which results from the sleep of weariness. For surely a novel, even if it be written "with a purpose," ought to be so written as if its author presumed it was to be read by an educated public. And an educated public is apt to resent having instruction forced down its throat according to fixed doses. Provide the material, if you will, and let the patients mix and measure their medicines: they may kill, but they will give more pleasure in the killing. If there is any information for the benefit of mankind contained in a novel, mankind will prefer to discover it in its own way, and draw its own morals. The superfluity of morality accordingly weighs down the book of Mr. Merriman; and, as the characters are all crushed to a dead level of mediocrity, it must be presumed that the weight was too much for them. There is, too, no lifelike presentment of the India of the Company, of the London of fifty years ago, of the Mutiny—only a stage background, before which the characters appear to speak their parts. Wherefore the whole is passing wearisome.

THE ALIBAG REVISION SETTLEMENT.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

Under this title there has just been published a collection of letters that appeared during the past two years or thereabouts in the *Times of India* and the *Bombay Gazette* on the subject, together with a variety of supplementary documents. The leading disputant, whose name appears on the title-page of the pamphlet, is Mr. Ramji Lakshman Gharat, a landholder of Avas, in the Alibag Taluka, in the Kolaba district: and his chief opponent, though writing under an assumed name, is believed by Mr. Gharat, on internal evidence of his letters, to be, "if not a survey officer himself, at all events a revenue officer intimately familiar with the taluka, and more especially with the revision work of the survey department in Alibag." Between the two, the questions at issue may be taken to be fully represented. The pamphlet bears to be "a series of letters indicating a departure in the Land Revenue Policy of the Bombay Government as applied to the Konkan districts." The object of the letters was sufficiently important, and it may be stated here in Mr. Gharat's own terms:

"That object was to call the attention of Government, of the Survey Department, and of the public generally, to the fact so notorious throughout the taluka, that the Revision Settlement was not the result of a careful examination of the different classes of soil, classed as 'workas,' 'rabi,' 'rice,' and 'garden,' but that it was a rough-and-ready valuation of them according to a pre-determined anna valuation scale based on the 'general position class.' Not the slightest attempt was ever made to ascertain by personal inspection the yield of lands classed as rabi and garden. This is literally the truth, and I challenge Colonel Godfrey, the settlement officer, to disprove it."

In the raiyatwari system of Bombay, we learn from Mr. B. H. Baden-Powell, "the actual rates selected for each class of soil recognised in each group or circle are empirical rates; they do not pretend to represent rental values or a share in the produce; but the soils are so classified and so accurately valued *relatively* that the rates, assumed to be fair as *maxima*, can be graduated to suit each degree of relative value in the individual field." Now, how are the actual full or maximum rates, "assumed to be fair," practically determined? Mr. B. H. Baden-Powell cites the late Mr. Pedder, "than whom no better authority can be quoted":

"The Bombay method is avowedly an empirical one. When a tract (usually a *táluka*) comes under settlement . . . . its revenue history for the preceding thirty or more years is carefully ascertained and tabulated in figured statements or diagrams. These show a juxtaposition for each year of the series the amount and incidence of the assessment; the remissions or arrears; the ease or difficulty with which the revenue was realised; the rainfall and nature of the seasons; the harvest prices; the extension or decrease of cultivation; and how these particulars are influenced by each other; the effect of any public improvements, such as roads, railways, or canals and markets, on the tract or on parts of it, is estimated; the prices for which land is sold, and the rents for which it is let, are ascertained. Upon a consideration of all these data, the *total* settlement-assessment (of the tract) is ascertained. That amount is then apportioned, pretty much in the same way, on the different villages; and the total assessment of each village is distributed over the assessable fields in accordance with the classification which has determined their relative value. . . .

Mr. Baden-Powell explains further that "it is a rule in Bombay to limit the increase taken, to 33 per cent. on the whole *táluka*, or 66 per cent. on the village total, or 100 per cent. on the single holding, above the last assessment." Further, section 107 of the Revenue Code expressly prohibits the increase of assessment in consequence of any private improvements effected during the currency of the previous settlement.

Very well—on paper. But it is obvious that everything depends (1) on the just fixing of the maximum rate, and (2) on the just classification of the various holdings according to the relative value scale. How is it possible to settle justly the rates for any holding without inspection in case of conversion, or without enquiry as to the cost and effects of the holder's own improvements? In fact, the complaint of Alibag amounts to this: that what the Government give with one hand it takes back with the other. While the Government professes the utmost anxiety not to cripple enterprise by levying revenue on the agriculturists' own improvements, it wrests from them a more than full equivalent by an oppressive use of the theory of "position." Mr. Gharat puts it as follows:

"It is in practice that the greatest deviations from sound principles are perpetrated and permitted without challenge or rebuke. For illustration, I need only point to the entirely new factor in the anna valuation of soils in re-classification work introduced in revision settlements in respect of the superiority which one field is supposed to possess over another in regard to position for the reception and retention of drainage or the advantage of what is called the 'general position' class. This ingenious device carries with it a tremendous power of enhancement, and gets from Government any amount of excess revenue that a settlement officer chooses to secure. It is an engine of powerful efficacy to work with. And yet it gives no trouble to the survey officer. All he has to do is to know the quantity of soil and water annas combined, so that on looking at the table specially prepared by the department for working out the classification annas, he is able to tell you what the 'position class' of any field is. With these two factors of soil and water annas, the settlement officer is able to drive a coach and six through any valuation of a field for 'position class.' He has not to visit the field, but is able to tell you from his easy chair in his office the 'position class' valuation of any field of which the soil and water annas are known."

The device was first applied in the Khandesh re-settlements, not only to soil classification, but also to village grouping; and it was condemned, not only by successive Collectors of Khandesh, but also by the then Superintendent of the Deccan Survey. The Alibag landholders have agitated in all the forms admittedly constitutional. They have had questions put in the Legislative Council, and the answers have been evasive. They have memorialised Government, asking for a representative commission of enquiry. So far, apparently, all in vain. We cannot deal with the arguments advanced in this pamphlet here, because they would be unintelligible without greater detail than our space permits. But we set forth the points of difficulty in Mr. Gharat's words:

"Our first complaint is that the old maximum rate for *workas* lands was four annas per acre, but the Settlement Department have unsettled the entire revision work by having it to mean a four anna valuation, and having *surveyed the workas lands of the táluká* by eye only and not by their actual produce, have enhanced the assessment above 300 per cent., and in places up to 1,200 per cent., *although there are extensive tracts of workas lands which cannot even grow a blade of grass*, far less any remunerative

produce, as admitted in Government Resolution No. 4380, dated 17th May, 1894."

If this be indeed so, then undoubtedly it is "a matter to which too much importance cannot be attached."

"A second noticeable point is the change made in the new classification of garden lands from the old 32 to 24-anna scale, the effect of which is to distinctly overclass soil and water factors, though the intention was to nominally confirm the old classification. On the other hand, the fact of the supreme importance of water in garden lands have had no adequate weight given to it."

Mr. Gharat expressly exempts from his censure Mr E. C. Ozanne, they Survey Commissioner. And in a manner justly; for says Mr. Ozanne, the newly adopted system of assessing garden lands "was the subject of much discussion, and I have accorded my full sanction as I cannot suggest a better method, though personally I do not like confirming the old water assessments, for the water classed was that made available by the enterprise of individuals more energetic than their neighbours. . . But the choice lies between total re-classification and to such system as that adopted, and I think that total re-classification would run a greater chance of taxing improvements" These words essentially contain an admission of injustice, and, more than that, the likelihood of greater official injustice if an attempt were made to do the right thing. It is a grievous commentary on the spirit of officialism.

"The third point is the exclusion of Alibag from the benefit of temporary remissions under Igatpuri Resolution (No. 3457, 4th May, 1885) in cases where the difference between the old and the new assessment is less than 8 annas. This is an instance of manifest injustice to the rayats of Alibag. The Hon. Mr. Nugent admits the exclusion, but excuses himself on the plea that the statements for the talukas of Alibag and Pen were prepared before the orders of Government were passed on the draft rules, and on the assumption that draft rule 2 would be approved, so that the instructions regarding remissions would not be given effect to. But admitting the plea, is it fair, I ask, that the poor and hapless rayats of Alibag should suffer because 'the preparation of new statements would have been a work of much time and trouble?'"

There can be no doubt that there is much substance in Mr Gharat's contentions, and he even deserves support from his opponent's points. It does seem strange that such a prolonged worry should have been permitted to go on, especially when the causes have met with such strong and varied condemnation from high officials thoroughly conversant with the reality and with the working of the system. Sir George Wingate, the creator of the system, said the last word of sound sense on the subject. "No unnecessary reduction," said Sir George, "can injure the country, and the Government revenue can only suffer from it to the extent of such reduction. An error upon one side involves the inevitable ruin of the country; an error upon the other, some inconsiderable sacrifice of the finances of the State; and with such unequal stakes depending, can we hesitate as to which should be given the preponderance? The line of true policy under such circumstances is not in an attempt to fix assessment at what the land will exactly bear, but in fixing it as far within this limit as the exigencies of the state will permit" It may indeed be pleaded that the exigencies of the State are now cruelly pressing, and that Sir George Wingate did not descry within the circle of his vision a Forward Policy on the Frontiers. The wheel always comes full circle. It is the old story of the effects of Militarism.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA.

BY J. DACOSTA.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister-at-law, practising in the High Court of Bengal, has just published two pamphlets on a subject which has deservedly attracted much attention—namely, the practice of the Government of India in vesting its revenue officers with judicial powers, and authorising them to adjudicate in all cases where illegality, injustice, or oppression is charged against themselves or their subordinates. The practice is calculated, by facilitating the enforcement of claims illegally asssessed, to encourage the imposition of illegal and oppressive assessments, and it is apt, moreover, to demoralise the Executive officers who are vested with quasi-arbitrary powers, by the temptation it offers to use those powers in improper ways.

One of Mr. Ghose's two pamphlets contains opinions expressed by eminent authorities on the system of uniting judicial and executive functions in one officer; and the other contains reports of authenticated cases illustrating the evils engendered by that system. Lord Cornwallis's opinion, as expressed in the preamble to Regulation II. of 1793, incontrovertibly demonstrates, in the following passage, the absolute necessity of separating judicial and executive functions:

"If the regulations for assessing and collecting the public revenue are infringed, the revenue officers themselves must be the aggressors, and it is obvious that individuals, who have been wronged by them in one capacity, can never hope to obtain redress from them in another. . . . . The revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial powers All financial claims of the public, when disputed under the regulations, must be subjected to the cognisance of Courts of Judicature superintended by judges who, from their official situations and the nature of their trusts, shall not only be wholly uninterested in the result of their decisions, but bound to decide impartially between the public and the proprietors of land, and between the latter and their tenants. The collectors of revenue must not only be deprived of their power of deciding upon their own acts, but rendered amenable for them to the Courts of Judicature, and collect the public dues subject to a personal prosecution for every exaction exceeding the amount which they are authorised to demand on behalf of the public and for every deviation from the regulations prescribed for the collection of it."

The *régime* established under Lord Cornwallis's legislation rapidly produced that extraordinary degree of prosperity which astonished the world, and powerfully aided in the consolidation of British power in India.

"In 1793 public credit was at the lowest ebb, and

the Government was threatened with hostilities from various powerful native chiefs. Lord Cornwallis saw that the only resource within his reach was to establish credit and to redeem the extensive jungles of the country. This important object could only be effected by giving the country a perpetual assessment." (*James Pattle, senior member of the Revenue Board, who died in Calcutta in* 1845)

"The Bengal of to-day offers a startling contrast to the Bengal of 1793: the wealth and prosperity of the country have marvellously increased—increased beyond precedent—under the permanent settlement." (*Burdwan Commissioner's Report.* "*Gazette of India,*" 20*th October*, 1883.)

This marvellous change was due entirely to the inauguration of a reign of Law where arbitary power had prevailed, and to the security and encouragement which were thus afforded to industrial enterprise and activity. Can any reasonable doubt be entertained that the contrary tendencies of the system denounced by Mr. Ghose will produce results in the contrary direction? In fact, the cases referred to by him clearly show that the prosperity and the popular attachment to British rule, which were so powerfully fostered by Lord Cornwallis's administration, are being undermined by the revival of arbitrary power, and by the illegalities and irregularities which sometimes disfigure the administration of law in India.

No Englishman can read the cases reported by Mr. Ghose without feeling shame and indignation at the violation of the first principles of equity and justice, and the disregard of the dictates of common fairness, which are too often to be traced in British tribunals in our Indian provinces. The danger inseparable from such a state of things must strike all who have friends and relatives, or material interests at stake, in that country.

INDIAN RAILWAY EXPLOITATION.

[FROM AN ANGLO-INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

The new boom in Indian railway exploitation which has arisen during the last eighteen months seems to please everybody. And no wonder. England is the mother, father, and grandfather of that imposing resource of modern civilisation—the highway of iron, with its steam-horse fed by the fuel provided for us in geological æons when this planet was without form and void. Do we not do well thus to extol our good fortune as heirs of the ages. But that is only a sentiment, says the cynic; and he proceeds to ask: How long will it last, and what is it all worth relatively to other methods of material development? This latter question, so far as it applies to our Indian empire, is more practical than may at first sight appear. Meantime, iron-masters and coal-owners, backed up by railway engineers and directors with whom "there's nothing like leather," have no misgivings, while financiers eagerly support them; and Whitehall politicians, whose motto is "India must pay," unite in declaring that theirs is the panacea to cure all the ills and privations that India's millions are heirs to.

This "boom" as regards the India railway system may be considered as having reached its acme of demonstration in the House of Commons on the belated Budget night. Then the past and present Indian Secretaries embraced each other, so to speak, with their mutual congratulations on this inspiring theme. For did not Sir Henry Fowler commit himself to the unqualified proposition that "*nothing* could tend to promote prosperity in India *more* than a large railway expenditure"; while Lord George Hamilton evoked lively cheers, even in that dreary atmosphere, with the announcement (as Sir Henry interpreted it) that he had arranged for the expenditure in the current year of Rx 12,000,000 on new railway construction? This is grand! With our iron-masters and locomotive builders hungering for new markets, with cheap money thirsting for interest, and financiers thirsting for commissions, such a spectacle is enough to induce a belief from our insular standpoint, that we are on the eve of an Anglo-Indian millennium—seeing that, as the jubilant Secretary remarked, "this country practically monopolises the imports (into India) of railway material." Here, in passing, it may be noted as legitimate ground for sober satisfaction that, thanks no doubt partly to Sir Henry Fowler's business qualities, Lord George was able to assure us that the tedious tangle as to terms and forms of railway guarantees to be given by the Indian Government, has at last been overcome and a solution found, which, in the notable instance of the Rothschild Burma Syndicate, results in the sweet simplicity of two-and-a-half per cent.

So much for the shining side of the shield of Indian railway exploitation. Let us glance at the shady side. The Secretary of State had made the broad statement that "the return on railroads is satisfactory;" and in proof of this recited "the percentage net receipts on lines in operation" in the three years 1893-4 to 1895-6 as 5·49, 5·72, and 5·82, respectively. Sir Henry Fowler repeated these statistics with that impressive emphasis which he is wont to bestow on details, and went on to rejoice over the decreed expenditure of twelve millions with that thumping assertion, quoted above, to the effect that a huge outlay on Indian railways is "wise" because it is "successful" and "a great boon to the people of India." Now Lord George, in reciting the percentages of net profits in India, had, in a parenthesis, dropped the fly into the ointment—"independent of exchange." His lordship, not being a commercially minded person, was not to be expected to perceive the enormous significance of this item, though it is a great fact, and by no means one of his "infinitesimal drawbacks." With Sir Henry Fowler the case is different. If anything, he is a man of business, of figures, and understands the dynamics of statistics. Therefore, one has some right to ask, was the former Indian Secretary justified, was it quite frank on his part, during his optimistic pæan on the unlimited "success" and "prosperity" of Indian railway exploitation, to ignore this very substantial drawback? For this factor is of the essence of his case, the financial test of all his argument. As there was no member ready to supply that missing link we must do so now; and this can easily be done from that unduly slighted

"Explanatory Memorandum,"—copies of which Blue-book served to relieve the monotony of the vacant green benches that evening. Now let my readers glance above at those assertions as to complete success of our Indian railways, and then read from page 15 of that official document, thus: "The result of the railway revenue account is to impose a *considerable burden* on the Government; in 1893-4 the net charge was Rx. 1,535,503, but the subsequent fall in exchange [value of the rupee] has added greatly to the expenditure, as will be seen from the following statement" of total railway receipts and expenditure, which show in the years 1894-5, 5-6, 6-7, net charge—that is, a deficit—of Rx. 2,348,489, 1,783,700, and 2,274,300, or close on a total of eight millions in these four years. I am quite aware of all that can be said as to the indirect and incidental advantages derived from Indian railways; but "finance tries all," and, seeing that in order to secure returns over the long haulages in the great peninsula, traffic rates, both for goods and passengers, have to be kept at the lowest practicable level, it is plain that these boasts as to "success" and "prosperity" of the Indian railway system are, at least, over-confident, and the claim as to the system being remunerative is arithmetically negatived. Therefore, it will be seen that it was scarcely fair to the House and the public that neither of the Indian Secretaries made more than mere passing reference to that "considerable burden" (emphasised above) which the railway system, as it exists at present, imposes on Indian finance and taxpayers. It is vain to try to evade this plain hard fact by saying that the deficit arises because "the expense of paying in England in gold is so heavy," for without British capital these railways could not have been made. There is a better, and, financially, more appropriate plea than that in bar of final judgment; but this pertains to a subsidiary portion of the subject, to which reference may be made later.

The financial and fiscal test of the too often vaunted remunerativeness of our Indian railways is not yet complete. There is in connexion with this subject, as is the case with some other Anglo-Indian assumptions, "a skeleton in the closet," which it suits Indian Secretaries (birds of passage as they are) to forget and ignore; though one may trust that it will not be entirely overlooked by the present Royal Commission, whose work is not merely for the day, or to prove that all is quite serene.

Now as to those—Indian Secretaries and others—who so confidently assure the public that an ever-increasing outlay on railways in India is a panacea for its material and industrial ills, let me invite them to refer to the Railway Administration Report for 1894-5 and take note of paragraph 18, statement No. 5 of the Director-General's elaborate exposition of the whole subject. They will find there the authentic disclosure of "Total losses by the State in working the railway system of India" from its inception in 1854 to the close of 1894. This presents the astounding total of Rx 51,212,406. Of this 30¾ crores are debitable to the Guaranteed railways—though since 1879-80, that does not include the East Indian line then purchased nor four others taken over at later dates. Those millions of purchase money have been added to the general public debt. It should be noted also that of the thirty millions the larger part—that is, twenty-three—had accrued before 1879-80, so that a stiff problem of compound interest arises thereon. It may be mentioned that up to 1872-3 "loss by exchange" is not included in these tables, it having been previously mixed up with the general charge under that head. Let some competent economist and statistician cast up and consider what that amount of arrears debitable to the Indian railway system—long since squeezed out of the public revenues—means in its pressure on the Indian peoples and their resources. It will then be seen how superficial and illusory—one had almost said puerile—were Sir Henry Fowler's bouncing assertions as to the liabilities and assets of India and the lightness of its taxation.

To revert a moment to that "considerable burden" on India now incurred by remitting interest on British capital, it may be noted that in respect of recent years this factor of exchange cuts both ways. Since, say, 1885-6 there has been large "gain by exchange" on that part of railway capital which is spent in India. Every English sovereign so spent on wages, work of engineering superintendence, and all indigenous materials—which may be roughly stated as one-third of the whole capital outlay—has expanded in India to from fifteen to eighteen rupees. This greater productiveness, so to speak, of the British sovereign is a direct set-off to the burden on the earlier railway transactions, and also indirectly affords an appreciable advantage to Indian industry and in public works outlay. From an incidental remark in the Secretary of State's speech the other day it would seem that the India Office is at last able to perceive that even the dark cloud of exchange has some silver lining to it; though on the same occasion Sir Henry Fowler indicated that he has not got beyond the crude, and—as demonstrated so often and in so many quarters—erroneous notion that "the great increase in net Indian expenditure is attributable in the main to the enormous loss sustained on exchange."

As already intimated, one can help the advocates of present and prospective Indian railway extension to some definite answer to that losing result of railway finance which has been demonstrated above. That large debt is in some proportion due to the onerous and peculiarly adverse terms of the original and, to a large extent, still operative contracts with the old guaranteed companies. And what is more to the purpose as an object lesson in practical finance, a very great part of that financial burden is due to the perverse blunder—I had almost said strange stupidity—of the India Office under the Duke of Argyll when the opportunity to supervise these adverse contracts was flung away in the early seventies. At that time the three great railways, the G.I.P., the B.B.C.I., and the Madras lines might have been acquired by the State and brought under its productive financial control. Fortunately the wisdom of that course was subsequently demonstrated by the acquisition of the East India system; but the unpardonable error in the former instances has, roughly speaking, cost the Indian taxpayer a score or so of millions sterling. Compared with this

loss which *was* preventible, the present "considerable burden" of exchange—which, as the helpless official doctors all declare, is beyond their power—is a mere bagatelle.

Several important aspects of this large and ill-understood subject remain to be dealt with on some other occasion. Passing reference must, however, be made once more to Sir Henry Fowler's daring proposition that "*nothing* could tend to promote the prosperity of India *more* than a large railway expenditure." I venture to traverse this statement emphatically. Sir Henry, as it were accidentally, mentioned the word "irrigation," which is a productive work without the heavy financial drawbacks, including exchange, set out above. For India, as Sir Charles Trevelyan said long ago, and as Sir Arthur Cotton has demonstrated beyond cavil, "water is gold." Speaking of water storage and conservancy as a whole, and including inland navigation as well as irrigation, it can be shown that the beneficent agency of that "boon to the people of India" would, million for million, "promote prosperity" by twice or three times the extent that can ever be attained by iron roads.

LORD WOLSELEY AND THE BRITISH AND INDIAN ARMIES.

[BY AN INDEPENDENT POLITICIAN.]

Lord Wolseley has missed a magnificent opportunity. From his position as Commander-in-Chief he could have made a deliverance that would have settled a good many questions in which India and England are interested. Above the suspicion of party bias and preferences, he was just the man to have been bold, honest, and statesmanlike. Many of us long for the appearance of such a clear-headed and brave-hearted man, who cannot be suspected of trying to win votes, or to trim his speech to party exigencies, or to look at Indian questions from the point of view of this year's or next year's Budget. A generous and discriminating Imperialist could have put English politicians right, and have soothed and satisfied the minds of the Indian people. A few months ago, I should have said that Lord Wolseley was such a man, that a sense of his position would have restrained him from jerking out opinions, as he formerly did when relations were strained between England and Ireland, and that he would have been glad of an opportunity of soaring into those still regions where the intellectual vision is sweeping and undisturbed by haze or by refractions.

I must confess that I am greatly disappointed. The evidence Lord Wolseley gave to the Royal Commission on the Military and Civil Expenditure of India, Wednesday, July 29, was one long series of surprises, as startling to read as it was painful to the majority of the members of the Commission to hear. The spirit which animated him throughout was the reverse of what one had a right to expect. The sagacious Commander-in-Chief was invisible, and in his place there was an extremely different being. The prudence, the judgment, the *aplomb* I associate with the office, and with Lord Wolseley when he is at his best, were entirely absent, and in their place was a mocking spirit, an acid sarcasm, a determination to give offence, to provoke the Commission to anger, to show his lordly sense of superiority to members of Parliament, ex-members, and champions of India, that was saddening, patent, and even humiliating. From first to last, Lord Wolseley seems to have made up his mind to be startling, offensive, and *bizarre.* He said the things he was not expected to say, and every question drew from him something more extraordinary. The first Lord Lytton, in his *Pelham*, describes Sir Henry Millington, a padded old gentleman, as being restless, erect, unwilling to settle anywhere. "The fact was, that poor Sir Henry was not that evening *made* to sit down; he had only his *standing up* coat on." When giving evidence on the occasion referred to, Lord Wolseley was in a like position. He was made up to be extravagant, to shock the Commission, to disturb common notions, to turn everything topsy-turvey. His evidence, as a whole, goes beyond the most extreme views held by any section of financiers, politicians, or military men.

A very little examination will substantiate these points. There is no party in this country—at least, I have never met with any sample of the class—which maintains the extraordinary proposition that he laid down when he said: "I think India should pay everything connected with the army." Mr. Buchanan put this question to Lord Wolseley, and he answered it in the way I have already described, that is, in an irritating fashion. "Should India pay every farthing of military expense?" There was room, in answering, for some prudent modification of the naked proposition already quoted. But Lord Wolseley dashed in with one of his daring and petulant answers, saying, "Yes, and the navy, too." It is difficult to believe he was serious, but the matter was too grave for a mess room joke, or a stage retort. The member of Parliament who should venture to maintain that India ought to pay for our army and our navy would be treated to that burst of laughter which is itself a solvent criticism. A Commander-in-Chief of the British army, who allows himself to dream of getting India to pay for the British army and navy, is less reasonable than a native Indian dreamer who sees a chance of Great Britain defraying the whole cost of the Indian army because it is essential to the maintenance of the British Empire in India. The Commissioners he addressed were seeking a balance, a fair adjustment, the reconciliation of Indian and Imperial interests. Lord Wolseley kicked over everything impetuously, and said, "Let India pay for all" Perhaps he had seen that whimsical inn in Yorkshire, called the "Four alls" and the descriptive lines:

"The Queen governs all,
The Parson prays for all
The Soldier fights for all,
The Farmer pays for all."

There are no politicians who hold the curious belief that England exists to maintain India in existence, though the duty of maintenance is admitted. It is a poor conception of Great Britain, which is something better than a reserve of men

and money for the Empire of India. The speeches and writings of the Indian journalists who trouble Lord George Hamilton's repose of mind may be searched in vain for any such theory. If they put their extravagant theories into words, they would be more disposed to say "the mischief of the situation lies in England holding the very contrary view, in thinking herself everything and India nothing."

Lord Wolseley's view of the British army as a mere Indian reserve, and as suffering because it is so, is another example of his capricious views. "The whole English Army that we maintain in England is a reserve to be sent to India whenever she requires, for which reserve India pays nothing." It is this plausible theory which accounts for the financial declaration already mentioned. No doubt the matter can be regarded in this way. There was a touch of the real Commander-in-Chief in the statement, because he was conceiving a series of events which might call for great exertions on England's part. But I cannot regard the reasoning as clear. It assumes, to begin with, a co-equal bargain between England and India, which is purely imaginary. There is no defensive treaty in existence. England does not maintain India purely in the interests of India, as this reserve and payment theory implies, but in her own interests quite as much—to put no strain on the words—as in the interests of India. The requirement implied is not an independent requirement. The Indian people would not say, "We want more troops." It would be the English people who would say, "You must have more troops." The fiction of an independent requesting authority in Calcutta, able to subordinate British to Indian interests, and to order troops from England, is manifest the moment we look at it. With the transformation of a supposed fact into a fiction, we must alter Lord Wolseley's declaration into something like this:—"The whole of the British army might have to be sent to India, in an emergency, to maintain its position as a great British dependency, if the British Government thought it advisable. To ask India to go on paying for the whole of the British army, as a Reserve, in view of such a great emergency, whilst it was used by the British Government as it thought fit, at other times, in Egypt or elsewhere, would be financially unsound. The authority which pays for the Reserve must always be in command of it. India, *quâ* India, has no command over the Reserve, and therefore contributes nothing to its maintenance."

Hardly less open to question is the assertion that having to recruit men to send to India augments our military difficulties at home. The argument advanced on this point is curiously two-edged. We enlist 16,000 men for Indian service every year. We should not want this number were India able to maintain her position without British troops. Hence, Lord Wolseley argues, we have a difficulty in recruiting the other 30,000 or 40,000 men we need. He then went on to say "we should have a better set of recruits" if there were no annual drafts for India. How this would be he left unexplained, and then he said, "We could always raise troops in England, but not in India." What, then, becomes of the difficulty of recruiting, one way or the other? If we send our best recruits to India, his remarks about them being likely to prove "a great nuisance in case of emergency at home" are inexplicable; whereas, if we send our worst recruits to India, the best stay at home, and the result is satisfactory from that point of view. But I am not convinced that there are any real recruiting difficulties, that service in India is unpopular, or that the 40,000 men we need every year would be better men if we had no Indian Empire to maintain.

Lord Wolseley went on to make two statements which cannot be suffered to pass unchallenged. The first was that "the younger soldiers were invalided in less proportion than the older ones." Now, the great scourge of the British soldier in India is enteric fever, and Mr. T. A. Percy Marsh, in the *Westminster Review*, for August, examining this special question, shows that there are 5·01 per cent. of cases of death from enteric fever in the first and second year of a British soldier in India, 1·38 in the third and fourth and, when over ten years can be recorded, none at all. In 1893, as the Government returns show, the deaths of the whole British army in India were 12·61 per cent. so that 5·01 per cent. of the young recruits, or nearly one half, die of enteric fever in the first and second year of service. The seasoned soldier becomes insured to the contagium of typhoid, if he may suffer from other ailments. The second assertion is that "after the soldier had been eight years in India the sooner he was got rid of in the interests of India the better." The great battles in India were won by men "between 21 and 30." The experience of others shows that our best officers in India are men who have been more than eight years in India; that the rank and file of this record have been equally good; that they won big battles; and that in the old Company's days seven-tenths of the men were over this period of service. But it is hardly necessary to labour either point.

Lord Wolseley's theory that the whole of the British army is maintained as a reserve "to be sent to India whenever she requires," drew from one of the Commissioners, Mr. Caine, the very natural query, "Surely the Indian army is quite as much a reserve force for our emergencies." The remark excited the gallant witness to one of his most extraordinary demonstrations. He quickly retorted, "We should not like to put our Indian troops in front of European soldiers," adding, "I should not like to fight France or Germany or any other army with Indian troops." Fortunately, we possess a less tricksical and snappish deliverance from the same witness. Writing in the *North American Review* for July, 1878, Lord Wolseley said, "The Sepoy possesses many of the highest military virtues." The Queen's jewels would be safer under "a Sepoy guard or a Sepoy sentry, than if committed to the care of European soldiers." Now, as to meeting the soldiers of another army, here is a significant passage:—

"Since the invasion of Russia by Napoleon, we have been accustomed to hear a good deal of Cossack troops, and of the advantages possessed by an army well-provided with them. We saw them in the Crimea, and *all who know our Indian cavalry infinitely prefer the latter*. They are far more intelligent, are better armed, and in every way better men, mounted on much better horses. Should we ever be engaged in any great

European war, we could easily send 10,000 of them from India, which, added to the 6,000 British sabres we could put in the field, would form a very imposing cavalry force."

Here is the contingency he dealt with, presented by himself, from an earlier deliverance. The Indian cavalry has improved since 1878, it has had more service, and it is now probably equal to any there is in Europe. The change of opinion on Lord Wolseley's part is inexplicable. The second judgment, when contrasted with the first, compels me to think that the former was delivered in a pet. It was mere headiness. He wanted to extinguish Mr. Caine, to fly another eccentricity in the air, and he stopped at nothing.

I turn now to the question of infantry. Here, again, we can appeal to the calm writer from the petulant witness. He praised the native Infantry in 1878, as well as the native cavalry. "The native infantry we could draw from India would be practically unlimited." Others beside himself thought so then, if opinions are modified now. The quotation proceeds:—"No European troops are such good marchers, and all who have learned, from personal experience with them in action" (Lord Roberts would endorse this, from a further and later experience than Lord Wolseley's) "to appreciate their fighting value, will agree with me in thinking that our recent discovery of how willing, nay anxious, our Indian army is to fight in this hemisphere, *will enable England to re-occupy the military position she held in the estimation of the world at the beginning of the century.*" Here we have Lord Wolseley, after the battles between Germany and France, regarding our Indian army as the reserve of the British army, as enabling us to hold our position amidst European conflicts. I am glad to be able to cite another authority on this point, Sir John Strachey wrote, in 1888, (*India*, p. 64)

"But it would be difficult to find in any country finer fighting material than that furnished by Gurkhas, Sikhs, and Pathans, and there is hardly any practical limit to the number of excellent troops that, in case of necessity, we could at short notice raise from the martial races of northern India. At the present time there are probably not less than 50,000 to 60,000 men in the native army equal to the troops of any European State, and fit to take their places in battle by the side of British soldiers."

It is unnecessary to dwell on the services our native Indian soldiers have rendered in Afghanistan, in Egypt, in Burma, in Chitral, and elsewhere. Lord Wolseley, in his pique, forgot all about them. He forgot what the Bengal army did in the Mutiny. It is true he has since, under some kind of pressure, issued a *communique*, in which he states that "the Commander-in-Chief entertains the highest opinion of the fighting qualities and efficiency of the Indian army," and that he refers to his 1878 opinion of the Indian cavalry. But, in his final sentence, he harks back to his evidence before the Commission, saying, that "for the purposes for which it exists" (is for purely Indian defence!) "the Indian army is as perfect as it can be." This correction amounts to little. It does not remove the unpleasant impression that all the time he was giving his evidence he was sneering at Indian officers of the British army who, he said, "knew very little of the organisation of the Imperial army all over the world;" and that he was especially comparing himself in private, with Lord Roberts, to the detriment of the latter. It was a most unfortunate exhibition of a narrow and pettish spirit. It was a defiance of general opinion, of experience, and of Imperial courtesy. In fact, nothing in the history of our connection with India has ever been said more calculated to give offence, to wound the spirits of brave men, to excite the pleasure of our enemies, or to weaken the bonds of brotherhood and affection which have been growing and strengthening between the British and the Indian armies, the people who tenderly call Victoria "Queen," and the people who joyfully salute her as "Empress."

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR REVISION.

By A. Nundy.

Mr. Justice Prinsep, whose full term as one of the judges of the High Court of Bengal has just expired, has been specially retained by the Government of India to revise the Civil and Criminal Procedure Codes which were passed in 1882, and have, since that year, been the subject of several amending Acts. There are some matters in respect of which there have been conflicting decisions by the various High Courts in India, others in respect of which, owing to the loose wording of the sections, it has been found impossible to give effect to the intentions of the Legislature. In some instances, moreover, the law as it now stands needs alteration, on the ground of its operating unfairly or harshly against one of the parties to a suit.

In the last-mentioned class may be included the law relating to the execution of decrees in cases of restitution of conjugal rights. When the British Government took into its own hands the responsibility for administering justice in the newly annexed territories, it publicly announced that in all questions regarding succession, inheritance, marriage or caste, or any religious usage or institution, the Muhammadan law, in cases where the parties were Muhammadans, and the Hindu law, in cases where the parties were Hindus, should form the rule of decision; and in the absence of such law the Court would be guided by considerations of justice, equity, and good conscience. This declaration was solemnly confirmed by provisions which are to be found in various enactments: in Regulation IV. of 1793, sec. 15, so far as the Mofussil was concerned, and in the several statutes passed in the reign of George III. constituting the Supreme Courts so far as related to the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, the said provisions being reaffirmed in the Letters Patent granted to these Courts. Though still professing to be guided by these principles, as a matter of fact the British Government has departed considerably from the lines originally laid down. The existing law relating to the restitution of conjugal rights furnishes a notable case in point.

The law as it stands at present is to be found in sec. 260 of the Civil Procedure Code, and is as follows:

"When the party against whom a decree for the specific

performance of a contract, or for restitution of conjugal rights . . . . has been made, has had an opportunity of obeying the decree or injunction, and has wilfully failed to obey it, the decree may be enforced by his imprisonment or by the attachment of his property, or by both."

It is assumed that any of her Majesty's Indian subjects can institute a suit for restitution of conjugal rights, and the penalty for non-performance of a decree in such a case is laid down to be imprisonment, etc. But it is a curious fact that before 1877 no positive provision with regard to this matter can be found in any legislative enactment. It seems as if the Legislature was afraid of rousing the susceptibilities of Hindus and Muhammadans by dealing with questions connected with their marriage law, with which (amongst other subjects) the Government professed, as it still professes, that it had no desire to interfere. But, most opportunely for the Legislature, the Courts of Justice, and notably the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, came to its aid, and cleared the way for the introduction of the present stringent provisions, which are a blot on the Indian statute law.

The first case decided by the Privy Council was that of *Ardasir Cursetji v. Pirozbyi* (6 M.I.A. 348), where it was held that

"A suit for the restitution of conjugal rights (which is strictly an ecclsiastical proceeding) cannot, consistently with the principles and rules of ecclesiastical law, be applied to parties who are Parsis—*i.e.*, non-Christians, and therefore the Bombay High Court, in the exercise of its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, had no power to entertain such a suit."

But the judgment added these significant remarks:

"The Civil Courts in India can bend their administration of justice to the laws of the various suitors who seek their aid. They must have some laws and customs which provide certain remedies, and these remedies the Civil Court might administer."

The Privy Council thus gave an implied sanction to the Civil Courts in India to entertain such suits, and to exercise a certain latitude in ascertaining what were the laws and customs of each community which would justify the exercise of such jurisdiction. This decision was followed in 1867 by what is known as the *Shumsulnissa Begum Case* (11 Moore, I. A., 551), which was an appeal from the judgment of the High Court of Bengal, refusing to exercise jurisdiction in a suit for the restitution of conjugal rights where the parties were Muhammadans. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that

"A Mussulman husband may institute a suit in the Civil Courts of India for a declaration of his right to the possession of his wife, and for a sentence that she return to cohabitation; and that suit must be determined according to the principles of Muhammadan law. . . . Disobedience to the order of the Court directing the wife to return to cohabitation would seem to fall within the 200th section of the Civil Procedure Code and to be enforceable only by imprisonment, or attachment of property, or both."

On the strength of these two authorities suits for the restitution of conjugal rights began to be instituted in the ordinary course in the Civil Courts of India, and in 1877 the Legislature became emboldened to put on the Statute Book the provision quoted above, which removed all doubts as to the power of the Civil Courts to try such suits.

But it would seem that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was not free from inconsistency. For though in the case of *Ardasir Cursetji v. Pirozbyi* it ruled that the High Court of Bombay had no power in the exercise of its Ecclesiastical jurisdiction to entertain a suit for the restitution of conjugal rights where the parties were non-Christians, yet it adjudged to the Indian Civil Courts the duty of redressing a wrong which had been declared as such only by the Ecclesiastical Law of England, and not by the Civil Law either of England or of any other country. In England a suit for restitution of conjugal rights was not part of the English Common Law or English Equity, but was peculiar to the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is not to be found in the American law. "Closely as the Americans," says Mr. Justice Melhill, "have in general followed the English law, they have deliberately excluded from their system the suit for the restitution of conjugal rights." The French law "has no process for compelling cohabitation of discordant couples." The Scotch enjoin "adherence," but not "reunion." The Muhammadans look upon marriage as a purely civil contract. The obligations which arise after marriage are laid down in detail. To be consistent, when the Civil Courts order a wife to resume cohabitation, they ought to be prepared to enforce these obligations. There is, in truth, absolutely nothing in the spirit or the general principles of Muhammadan law to support the inference that it contemplated that a suit by one party could be brought against another for the restitution of conjugal rights. The decision of the High Court of Bengal in the *Shumsulnissa Case* was, therefore, in strict accordance with Muhammadan law when it held that the proper remedy, if there is one, is the denial of maintenance to a rebellious wife, or at most a suit for damages. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, acting under the influence of the Ecclesiastical law of England, held otherwise, though the reasoning of their Lordships is curious. They could cite no express authority on the point, because none existed. But they argued that the Muhammadan law strongly favoured the husband—he can dissolve the marriage tie at his will, and whilst the marriage subsists the husband's power is considerable—and therefore that the husband had a right to sue his wife to resume cohabitation. But how if a Muhammadan wife were the plaintiff in a suit for restitution of conjugal rights? This reasoning would scarcely hold good in her case. It would in fact go to show that she was not entitled to a privilege accorded to her husband. But such a result the Judicial Committee of course never for a moment contemplated.

With the Hindus marriage is a religious ordinance. The duties are religious, and enforced by religious machinery. The only case contemplated by law is that of a wife deserting her husband, and the only penalty laid down is a fine to the king. But no provision is made that the king shall order her to go back to her husband, nor do any of the treatises on Hindu law contemplate or sanction proceedings in Court to force a wife to resume cohabitation.

It is therefore evident that the Civil Courts in India are acting in direct contravention of Hindu and Muhammadan law when they entertain suits by members of these religions for the restitution of

conjugal rights, and moreover that the Government is not, as it undertook to be, guided in cases relating to marriage by the laws which appertain to these communities. True, it might be urged that the Courts are influenced by considerations of equity and good conscience, or in other words by principles of natural justice. But it would be as well to drop the legal fiction that the Courts base their decisions upon the precepts to be found in Hindu or Muhammadan jurisprudence. The matter resolves itself into the question whether it is desirable, for the ends of justice, that the Civil Courts should have jurisdiction to try these matrimonial cases? And although, on the one hand, it may be conceded that in certain cases it is desirable, on the other hand it ought to be admitted that these proceedings are really the shadow of similar proceedings which had their origin in the Ecclesiastical Courts of England. We should then have some clear notion as to what the law is which ought to govern such cases.

Now, if the principles of ecclesiastical law are to be applied at all, they ought to be applied in their integrity. No Court in England would for a moment countenance the idea of giving a decree for the restitution of conjugal rights unless it was proved that the party complained against had of his, or her, free will consented to the solemnisation of the marriage. Yet what do we find in India?—a girl married in tender years to a man with whom she has never lived as his wife, being ordered by the Civil Courts to surrender herself to him, stranger though he really is, and although she may have the most cordial dislike for him. In the famous Rukhmabai case, had not the matter been otherwise settled, it was possible for the Bombay High Court to pass such an order. And what if the order had been disobeyed? The defendant would have been liable under section 260 of the Civil Procedure Code to be imprisoned in the common gaol.

When the Rukhmabai case was being heard by the Bombay High Court, the feelings of the educated classes in India were intensely roused against this iniquitous provision in the Civil Procedure Code, and so great was the agitation that Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, took notice of it, and in 1890 publicly admitted the need of amending a law which he called "an excrescence grafted from an extraneous jurisprudence." An opportunity soon presented itself to the Government when the Bill for amending certain sections in the Civil Procedure Code was before the Council. A clause modifying the law so far as to make it a matter of discretion for the Court to enforce, or not to enforce, such a decree by imprisonment, was introduced. The Hindu judges of the several High Courts pronounced in favour of this amendment. The Central Muhammadan Association of Bengal was equally desirous of relaxing the rigour of the law, and there was almost a consensus of opinion so far as the educated classes were concerned. Yet the Select Committee threw out the clause on the ground that they were unwilling to rouse the susceptibilities of the people, who, it was said, were not yet ripe for such a change in the law—as if the existing law were a cherished heirloom of the Hindus and Muhammadans which they had inherited from their ancestors, instead of its being a palpable importation from the ecclesiastical law of England!

Naturally, a law so obnoxious is seldom enforced. Happily there are not many cases in which application is made for punishing by imprisonment a recusant wife. The instincts of the people revolt against measures not sanctioned by their own laws. But a few months ago a case of this kind arose in Karachi, which the presiding judge disposed of in a curious way. He remarked—

"There is something extremely repugnant to one's ideas of propriety, indeed, of mere decency, in insisting on a woman's returning to a man whom she hates, and of imprisoning her like a criminal if she does not go back to him in accordance with the Court's decree; and in the famous case of Rukhmabai, though a decree was given to her husband, I do not think that matters were pushed so far as imprisoning her for disobedience to the decree."

Accordingly the judge got over the difficulty by ruling that the word "may" in Sec. 260 gave him a discretionary power either to order imprisonment or not to a party disobeying the order to resume cohabitation.

In conclusion, it would appear to be established that suits for the restitution of conjugal rights are foreign to the instincts of the people of India; that they have their basis in, and have been imported from, the Ecclesiastical Courts of England; that they have been extended to cases not contemplated by the Ecclesiastical Courts of England, *i.e.*, to persons who were not consenting parties to the marriage tie; and that imprisonment for disobedience to a decree in such cases is repugnant to the feelings of the people. Mr. Justice Prinsep and Mr. Chalmers, the Legal Member of Council, who are now engaged in revising the Civil Procedure Code, would do well to take this matter into their serious consideration, and it is earnestly hoped that they will embody in the new Bill provisions, which (*a*) will leave it to the discretion of the Courts to give or to withhold a decree against persons whose marriage was contracted when they were unable to give their free consent to such marriage, and (*b*) will abolish altogether the existing power to enforce such a decree by imprisonment.

THE DEBATE ON THE "INDIAN BUDGET."

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

REVOLT AGAINST OFFICIAL OPTIMISM.

We reproduce below extracts from the English press referring to the recent debate on the Indian Budget, as it is rather inaccurately termed. It would be easy, if space permitted, to increase the number of favourable—and, of course, of unfavourable—opinions. On the whole, it may be said, without rashness, that signs are not wanting to show that in British public opinion there is a growing revolt against official optimism in Indian affairs.

"TAXATION HAS REACHED THE LIMITS OF SAFETY."—*Times.*

"It is well to realise the exertions which India has made in order to convert deficit into surplus. The present and the

past Secretary of State showed themselves alive to this aspect of the case. It is not only a question of new import duties on the middle classes and of a salt tax raised to a very heavy rate upon the poor, it is also a question of local cesses and rates which do not enter into Imperial finance, and which are therefore seldom heard of in Parliament, but which sometimes press with greater severity than the Imperial taxes on the people. The important State paper by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, to which we lately called attention, forms the true complement to Thursday evening's debate. India is solvent. In regard to a very large part of her public debt she can show, as Sir Henry Fowler pointed out, ample assets in the shape of railways and reproductive works. In return for her annual expenditure she enjoys a peace and prosperity never known under a previous rule. Yet these facts should not make us forget that she has to maintain her solvency, and to pay for her peace and prosperity by a taxation which her Imperial and provincial financiers alike declare to have reached the limits of safety. As her resources develop those limits will in time extend. The difficulty is to prevent the increase of Indian public burdens from exceeding the rate of Indian industrial progress."

"A Dismal Farce."—*Daily News*.

"Before this eventful Session comes to an end, and the weary supporters of the strongest Government of modern times can depart to the moors, the Indian Budget has had to be squeezed in somehow. But who cares about it? Not, it would seem, the Legislative Council of India, who polished it off last March in something less than two sittings, without a division and without amendment. Not, we imagine, the House of Commons, where Sir J. Westland's handiwork served to empty the benches at the eleventh hour of an expiring Session. Yet somebody, one cannot help thinking, must be interested in a financial statement which, among other trifles, provides for an expenditure of more than nine hundred and seventy millions of rupees. It is usual, no doubt, for Englishmen to render these big totals less formidable to the eye and the ear by writing and talking in terms of "Rx." ——, which, in happy days gone by, were practically the equivalent of a £. But the Indian rayat does not count like that. People are less glib about "tens of rupees" in a country where the average income is estimated, not without authority, at something under twenty-five rupees a year. Perhaps one of the reasons why the House of Commons finds the annual discussion on the Indian Budget such a dismal farce is that it does not, in any true sense, discuss the Budget at all. . . . . When it is said that the Indian Budget comes before the House of Commons, all that is meant—or, at all events, all that is true—is that the House of Commons is invited to accept the totals shown in the closed accounts for the year before last."

"Exchange cannot be made the Scapegoat."—*Daily Chronicle*.

"Omitting minor differences, there are two opposite explanations of the embarrassments of Indian finance. One is that the Government of India is inclined to extravagance, and especially in military matters; the other is that the fall in the exchange value of the rupee is the *fons et origo mali*. It is hardly necessary to say that the former view does not find favour with the Government of India. Now in 1895-6 exchange turned out much better than was expected, and in the current year, 1896-7, there seems every prospect of this good fortune being maintained. In his Budget for 1895-6 the Indian Finance Minister had to make provision for an expenditure of Rx.13,250,000 on exchange, besides large sums for exchange compensation and the sterling pay of the British troops. The revised estimate for 1895-6, and the Budget estimate for 1896-7, show totals well under Rx.12,000,000; while altogether, through the improvement in exchange, there is a lessened expenditure of over Rx.1,500,000 in 1895-6, and of over Rx. 1,750,000 in 1896-7. This time, at any rate, exchange cannot be made the scapegoat. We turn, then, to the expenditure on the army. Omitting exchange, the cost of the army was in 1894-5, Rx. 18,900,000 (about Rx. 400,000 less than in 1893-4); in the Budget for 1895-6 it was estimated at Rx. 19,750,000 (Chitral, Rx. 150,000!); in the revised estimate for 1895-6 it has grown to Rx. 20,750,000 (Chitral, Rx.1,650,000!); and for the current year, with no Chitral expedition to swell the total, it is Rx. 20,300,000. In two years Rx. 1,400,000 has been added to the annual cost of the army, apart from the sum spent on the Chitral expedition."

"Room for Many Economies."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"Lord George Hamilton for some reason or other, felt it necessary to dwell on this embarrassing feature of Indian finance (*ie.* exchange). He repeatedly warned the House that calculations as regards future Budgets must continue to some extent guess-work so long as the Indian Government is liable to such sudden and disasterous falls in the exchange as that which occurred in 1894-5. No doubt there are authorities who will hold that the Secretary of State has exaggerated the influence of this adverse feature in Indian finance, to the neglect of other avoidable drains on the resources of India. He certainly spoke in more eulogistic terms of the system of control over expenditure in India, which he considers to be more efficacious than in this country, than even Indian finance authorities like Sir David Barbour and Sir William Wedderburn have been in the habit of employing; and, without pretending there is no room for improvement in this country, we may take leave to doubt whether, even apart from the policy of military adventure of which the Chitral expedition was an illustration, there is not room for many economies in the administration of Indian without any sacrifice of efficiency. Leaving this question on one side for the present, however, it may be that Lord George Hamilton had his own reasons for specially pressing on the attention of the House last night the disadvantages of a fluctuating exchange."

"The Enormous Increase in Civil and Military Expenditure."—*Daily Chronicle*.

"The total increase (as compared with 1884-5) in expenditure of Rx. 14,150,000 is made up as follows:—

Collection of Revenue and Civil Services generally	Rx. 7,500,000
Military Services	8,500,000
Increased cost of Government (Exch. Rx. 5,600,000)	16,000,000
Debt and Commercial Services (Exch. Rx. 4,700,000)	—650,000
Famine Grant and Railway Construction	—1,200,000
Net increase as above	Rx. 14,150,000

"The Financial Position.

"A fair statement of the improvement or deterioration in the financial position may be arrived at by taking the difference between the sum of the improvements and the sum of the deteriorations in both revenue and expenditure. The account then stands thus:

"Improvement.—1884-5—1896-7.

Natural increase in Land and Forest Revenue	Rx. 4,500,000
Natural increase from Taxes	4,750,000
Increase from Tributes	200,000
Increased expenditure under Debt and Commercial Services	650,000
Total Improvement	Rx. 10,100,000

"Deterioration.—1884-5—1896-7

Increased Taxation, Land	Rx. 500,000
" Taxes	6,000,000
Loss of Opium Revenue	1,550,000
Increased cost of Civil Services	7,500,000
" " Military Services ..	8,500,000
Diminished provision against Famine, etc.	1,200,000
Total Deterioration	Rx. 25,250,000
Deduct Improvement	10,100,000
Net Deterioration	Rx. 15,150,000

To this large deterioration in twelve years of Rx. 15,150,000, exchange cannot be properly said to have contributed much more than one-third—namely, Rx. 5,600,000. We must look to the enormous increase in civil and military expenditure if we would find an adequate cause for these tremendous figures."

Indian Opinion on Military Expenditure.—*Daily News.*

"The surplus was due to an unexpected saving on exchange. But for this windfall, there would have been a deficit. As it is, the Government of India partially restores the Famine Insurance Fund, which had been suspended, and makes Lord George Hamilton's clients in Lancashire a present of five millions of rupees. The present Government also, reversing the policy of their predecessors, have occupied Chitral, regardless of expense and of Lord Elgin's proclamation. Mr. Balfour assured an audience at Glasgow last November that the cost of this operation would be 'absolutely insignificant.' Perhaps he was thinking of the preliminary estimate of 1,500,000 rupees. Sir James Westland, who remarks significantly that 'the financial statement is not the place in which to defend the policy of the expedition or the occupation which has followed it,' shows that it has cost India 672,000 rupees in the accounts of 1894-95, 16,475,000 rupees in the revised estimate of 1895-96, and a further sum of 200,000 rupees in 1896-97. To these amounts have to be added a sterling expenditure of £16,000 and a 'legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral and of its communications,' estimated for 1896-97 at 2,317,000 rupees. Needless to say, this expenditure has been much criticised in India, where educated opinion ascribes the chronic embarrassments of the Government not to loss by exchange, but to overgrown military expenditure."

"Indian Accounts not 'Ideally Perfect.'"—*Times.*

"Sir William Wedderburn's amendment illustrates the views of many who think that the salvation of India is to be found in Parliament. His proposal for a Select Committee of the House to review the Indian accounts year by year would unquestionably bring them under a scrutiny more exact than the present Indian Budget debate in Parliament pretends to. But such a scrutiny, if it is to be of value, must be a scurtiny of Indian finance rather than of Indian accounts. We may not quite literally accept Mr. Cohen's certificate that the present system of Indian accounts is "ideally perfect." Yet any one whose business it has been to study the question will agree with him that the Indian accounts are as clear and business-like a statement of the facts as is likely to be obtained. It is certainly a more clear and business-like presentment than a Select Committee of the House could hope to supply. Sir Henry Fowler was justified in protesting against the idea that a mass of figures was thrown on the Table of the House without anything to guide members as to their meaning. It would be more correct to say that every member of the House has had in his possession a clear and detailed explanation of the Indian accounts for many weeks before the Indian Budget debate comes on. It is this circumstance which tends in no small measure to take the vitality out of the debate for many of the most practical members, and to explain the thin attendance at it."

"All-Devouring Military Expenditure."—*Star.*

"When, therefore, Sir James Westland invites us to rejoice with him over his Budget Estimate, we look at this all-devouring military expenditure, we look at the neglect of education and public works, we observe the declaration of successive Secretaries of State that the union of judicial and executive functions—of judge and detective—in India is only continued because of financial straits, and we reply that it is one thing to govern a country and another thing to balance its books. We look, also, at the famine insurance fund which, after frequent suspension—on one occasion, when 'exchange compensation allowance' was granted by Anglo-Indian officers *to themselves*—is now only partially restored. Yet when the new taxation was imposed to create the fund it was officially stated that 'no desire to carry out any administrative improvement, however urgent, or any fiscal reform, however wise, would tempt the Government to neglect this sacred trust.' Sir James Westland, thanks to an unexpected saving on exchange, found himself at the beginning of this year with a little money to the good. How did he employ it? Did he suggest that detectives should no longer act as judges? Did he make a grant for education? Did he reduce the salt tax? Did he remit some part of the oppressive rents exacted by the Government of India? Not a bit of it. At the bidding of Lord George Hamilton he financed the occupation of Chitral, and so rearranged the cotton duties for the benefit of Lancashire as to involve a net loss of Rx. 500,000 per annum to the Indian revenues."

"Reckless Official Optimism."—*Daily Chronicle.*

"The statement which Lord George Hamilton made to the House yesterday afternoon was more remarkable for what it left out than for what it contained. About three weeks ago, when commenting on the Indian financial statement, we ventured to hint that certain facts worthy of attention would not receive due prominence in the Indian Secretary's Budget speech. We then pointed out that since 1893-94—only three years ago—there has been an increase of expenditure (not counting exchange, that whipping-boy of the Indian Government) of over one and a-half millions, of which more than one million was under the head of "Army"; that half a million had been diverted from the Famine Fund, and that Rx. 2,800,000 of fresh taxation had been imposed. So far as the Army is concerned, if the comparison be made with 1894-5—only two years ago—there has been an increase under this head alone of nearly one and a-half millions, again without exchange. Yesterday we published a detailed analysis of the Indian financial position compared with what it was twelve years ago. That analysis showed in figures beyond the reach of controversy that a very serious deterioration had taken place in Indian finance in recent years. Heavy additional taxation, heavy loss under certain heads of revenue, heavy increase in civil and military expenditure, reduced expenditure on famine insurance—these are notorious matters which no official ingenuity can describe as other than a cumulative worsening of the financial position. In the face of facts such as these, Lord George Hamilton's review of the situation was an extraordinary exhibition of reckless official optimism."

"Anglo-Indian Complacency."—*Star.*

"It is to be regretted that Lord G. Hamilton—who reversed the ordinary procedure yesterday—was not able to accept Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment, for the annual scrutiny of the Indian accounts by the methods, *mutatis mutandis*, which we apply to our own. Mr. Bhownaggree, whose speeches rather unpleasantly indicate a desire to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, called attention to the scandalous union, in one and the same official in India, of the functions of magistrate and constable, judge and detective, court of appeal and public prosecutor. The only avowed pretext for the system is the expensiveness of reforming it. But how does that square with Lord G. Hamilton's words of consolation? Mr. Bhownaggree's position with reference to the India Office and the Tory party suggests, by contrast with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's, a parody of Kipling :—

> Oh! it's 'black man' this, and 'black man' that, and
> 'black man' all the day ;
> But it's 'learned friend Bhownaggree,' when he gives
> his pals away.

Lord G. Hamilton propounds the truly remarkable theory that the only standard by which British rule in India may be judged is the standard of the rule which it superseded or which might take its place. Has Anglo-Indian complacency really come to this? Surely there is another standard—the standard of our own conception of duty—of what we owe to ourselves."

"The most Satisfactory for Many Years."—
St. James's Gazette.

"The Indian Budget statement last night was the most satisfactory that has been submitted for many years. Revenue is increasing and expenses are being kept well in hand, so that Lord George Hamilton, who is not much of an optimist, was able to state that the last year had been 'a very remarkable' one, and that there were hopes that it marked the commencement of a new financial era. The gross accounts show a surplus of Rx. 1,604,000, and the revised estimates a surplus of Rx. 905,200. Economies have been effected in many quarters, and there is a general advance under most heads of revenue. For the financial year 1896-97 the estimated surplus is Rx. 463,000, in spite of an increase in the famine fund reserve, and some additional expenditure for special purposes on the army. For the first time since 1891 the Indian Secretary is able to show a surplus for each of the three years with which he deals, and, as Lord George said, "What makes the surpluses more satisfactory is the fact that they are honest surpluses and that the total expenditure has been defrayed without a loan."

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1896.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S OPTIMISM.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, at the close of the characteristic speech which he delivered on August 13th, on the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts, observed that no Secretary of State had ever performed that duty without being impressed by the immense range of subjects with which he had to deal, and the multiplicity and complexity of the questions on which he was asked to give an opinion. The remark suggests at least two obvious reflections. In the first place, it seems odd that so large and complex a subject should be relegated to a solitary evening in the last week of the Session. In the second place, it is no doubt true that a Secretary of State, having so many subjects to choose from, is tempted to select those which are the easiest—those upon which, with the least expenditure of trouble, there is the greatest opportunity of being plausible. But one of the chief tests of a Minister's fitness for his office consists precisely in the extent to which he overcomes temptations of this kind. The temptation is, of course, all the greater when he knows beforehand that his audience will be meagre and not greatly interested, and that he may count upon the aid of the Front Opposition Bench in denouncing, though not perhaps in demolishing, the objections of independent critics. Lord George Hamilton succumbed to the temptation. If his speech had been prepared for him by the permanent officials at the India Office, if he had accepted purely departmental reports without scrutiny and without question, and if he had contributed to this compost merely a spice of general benevolence and optimism, his speech would not have been very different from what it was. We look, as some members, at any rate, of his audience listened, in vain for any hint of a disposition to regard Indian finance from the point of view of the mass of unrepresented Indian taxpayers—to scrutinise the purposes and the amounts of expenditure with the jealous eye of those who bear the burden of taxation and realise day by day the disadvantages that arise from the neglect of necessary works. To say this is not to question the excellence of Lord George Hamilton's intentions in general. Still less is it to disparage the admitted benefits of British rule in India. The point is that Lord George Hamilton, instead of grappling with the really crucial and fundamental topics, was content with the less exacting task of summarising the accounts from the standpoint of a Treasury official, and obscuring difficulties, dangers, and the force of adverse criticism under a cloak of optimistic rhetoric. Secretaries of State for India are, of course, accustomed, in dealing with Indian finance, to look chiefly at the bright side. But Lord G. Hamilton's optimism was more than usually aggressive and pronounced. He talked of a "remarkable improvement" in the financial condition of India, and of the Indian Government's "remarkable frugality and "vigorous supervision over expenditure." He congratulated the House of Commons upon a series of "honest surpluses." Finally, he contrasted the "infinite benefits" of British rule in India with what he thought fit to describe as its "infinitesimal "drawbacks."

Lord George Hamilton adopted an unusual course in making his financial statement, not in Committee, but on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair. The House, he said, had met for the purpose of discussing Indian finance, while the amendments of which notice had been given were "purely academic "in character." This was an odd pretext for avoiding inconvenience. The House consisted, when Lord George Hamilton rose, of some 22 members, most of whom had come to discuss the amendments. One of the amendments dealt with a matter which was strictly financial, while another dealt with a grievance which, according to two successive Secretaries of State for India, would have been removed but for financial objections. The attention of the House of Commons is seldom, and with difficulty, directed to Indian questions, and it is a serious thing to tamper with the freedom of debate upon the motion to go into Committee. If Lord George Hamilton had been more candid he would have admitted that the purpose of his unusual procedure, as it was also the purpose of the Government in confining the debate to a single day, was to curtail discussion. He began his speech with the usual lamentation over the "unfortunate consequences of erratic exchange." This bogey has ceased to be plausible. Nor will it again become plausible until the Secretary of State meets the contention, which is universally urged in

India, and which, as we show elsewhere, is now widely held in England, that the chronic embarrassments of the Indian Treasury are due, not to loss by exchange, but to the excessive growth of civil and military (especially military) expenditure. The lamentation was this year even more misplaced than usual. Exchange may be erratic. But its consequences, far from being unfortunate on this occasion, are the "honest surpluses" on which Lord George Hamilton dwelt with so much pride. In the financial year 1895-96 the rate of exchange, estimated at 13·09d., was really 13·68d., an increase which, on Lord George Hamilton's own admission, yielded an aggregate improvement of Rx. 1,610,000. As the surplus which is now shown in the Revised Estimates for that year is Rx. 951,400, it does not require the omniscience of an "expert" to perceive that but for the consequences of erratic exchange, there would have been a deficit. Lord G. Hamilton had a good deal to say about the restoration of the Famine Insurance Fund. Sir James Westland himself admits that the restoration is only "partial." Lord G. Hamilton committed another grave inaccuracy when he said that the annual payment to the Famine Insurance Fund was originally fixed at Rx. 1,500,000. If he will refer to Lord Lytton's Minute of March 12th, 1878, he will find that the payment was to be "at the rate of one and a half millions *sterling* per "annum." It is curious that a specialist in exchange should overlook so important a difference. Sir James Westland observed, rather significantly, that the Financial Statement was not the place in which to defend the policy of the Chitral expedition, or the occupation which had followed it. Lord G. Hamilton is clearly of a different opinion. His defence, however, took the form of the paradox that a frontier in High Asia will lead to reduced expenditure. But then the Secretary of State is not required to balance the accounts. That is a duty which belongs to the Finance Minister.

It is interesting to learn that since Lord George Hamilton has been at the India Office he has "made "a point" of reading translations of Indian newspapers. Translations are not always so accurate as might be desired. Lord G. Hamilton complains of the "acerbity" of Indian newspapers. They indulge —*O tempora, O mores!*—in "general depreciation "of our rule." Hence the impiety of "attaching "undue importance to the infinitesimal drawbacks "of our rule and ignoring its infinite benefits." Lord G. Hamilton is not the first critic who has denounced, and excited Tory cheers by denouncing, the native press of India. The late Sir George Chesney made the same mistake—and was corrected for it by Sir Richard Garth, who, like Lord George Hamilton, is a Tory, but, unlike Lord George Hamilton, has been Chief Justice of Bengal. "I can only say," Sir Richard Garth wrote, "that I read native papers "myself week after week, and never see anything "there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty "or disrespect to British rule. What I do find there, "and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well-"deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many "of the Government officials. I am afraid this is "exactly what the Government would wish to re-"press. I consider it a most wholesome and salu-"tary means of bringing the misconduct of Govern-"ment officers to the notice not only of the Indian "people but of the Courts of Justice." If Indian politicians and journalists seem to Lord George Hamilton to lay too much stress upon grievances, may not one reason conceivably be that those who are set in authority over India lay too little stress upon them? May not a Secretary of State conceivably encourage criticism and objection when his annual statement is, from end to end, little else than a series of superficial congratulations. To talk about remarkable improvements, and honest surpluses, and the Government's frugality, as if that were the whole of the matter when, as Lord G. Hamilton knows, the taxes of India are being swallowed up in "harum-scarum" military enterprises while, as he admits, there are no "taxable "resources that are not now in operation," is—to put the thing on no higher ground—in the last degree imprudent. The gross expenditure for which provision is made in the Budget Estimate, 1896-97, amounts to Rx. 97,157,600. Of this amount Rx. 11,156,900 are swallowed up by "direct de-"mands on the revenue"—in other words, by charges in respect of collection—Rx. 15,393,500 are absorbed by "salaries and expenses of civil depart-"ments," and Rx. 25,583,900 are set down for "Army Services," which, of course, by no means represent the total military expenditure. Meantime education is neglected, public works are starved, enhancements of land revenue have created widespread discontent, and the hateful salt-tax, as Lord G. Hamilton says, and as even Sir H. Fowler is prepared to admit, "cannot be put higher, because it is "higher now than one could wish it to be." The educated classes in India might be disposed to dwell less vehemently upon matters like these if the India Office and the Government of India were less inclined to ignore them or to gloss them over. It is official optimism that tinges Indian discontent with the bitterness of despair. It is doubtless easy to maintain, as Lord G. Hamilton does, that British rule in India is better than the rule which it superseded or the rule which might take its place. That is not the point, and we are very sure that public opinion in the United Kingdom would hold, in spite of Lord G. Hamilton, that that is not the standard. The standard is what might be done, and what, therefore, ought to be done. For British conceptions of duty and self-respect we need not go to departmental apologists. But even departmental apologists may be brought to see the unwisdom of burying their heads in the sand.

WANTED: EFFECTIVE SCRUTINY.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN'S amendment to the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts was defeated by a majority of 80 votes (110—30). The proposal which it made was, as its author said, both simple and moderate. Its purpose was merely to secure the more effectual discharge by the House of Commons of its existing duty in respect of Indian finance. The particular

means which it suggested towards this end was the appointment of a Select Committee to examine and report upon the East India Accounts year by year. There is already a Standing Committee for the regular examination of the Public Accounts of the United Kingdom. What Sir W. Wedderburn asked was that the advantages of such an enquiry might, *mutatis mutandis*, be extended to India. The thirty members who supported the proposal in the division-lobby included Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Philip Stanhope, Mr. T. M. Healy, and Mr. Michael Davitt. The majority against it included Mr. A J. Balfour, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and those distinguished Anglo-Indian "experts", Mr. Joseph and Mr. Austen Chamberlain. It was said of the Duke of Argyll a few years ago that he had developed into a thorough-going Tory, and that his feudal instincts were almost as strong as Mr. Chamberlain's. Mr. Chamberlain's bureaucratic instincts are now almost as strong as Sir Henry Fowler's. The majority and the minority offer to the student of that most fascinating of all movements, the course of events, many points of contrast. One of them is that most of the thirty members who voted with Sir W. Wedderburn had heard the debate, while nearly all the 110 supporters who rallied round Lord George Hamilton were summoned by the division-bell from the terrace, the smoking-room, the library, and those private rooms where, beyond these voices, there is rest for the jaded Minister. Perhaps, indeed, it would be more accurate to say that these automatic voters, who so eloquently and so frequently deprecate the introduction of party bias into Indian debates, rallied round Sir Henry Fowler. For it was he, and not Lord George Hamilton, who replied, or made a pretence of replying, to Sir W. Wedderburn. Archbishop Magee said of John Bright that he divided his opponents into knaves and fools, with the third class of bishops, who united the characteristics of both the others. It may be said, without much fear of contradiction, that the spirit of John Bright is not the spirit of Sir Henry Fowler. If there is one thing which gives more evident delight to the member for Wolverhampton than adoring a political opponent, it is denouncing a political ally. This amiable characteristic has been so often displayed by its owner that the House of Commons, and the public, are now accustomed to it. But it is a pity that Sir Henry Fowler cannot gratify his disposition, and fulfil his purposes, without flagrantly misinterpreting the matter under discussion. His speech in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn was, from first to last, irrelevant because it was based upon a series of misconstructions.

No unprejudiced observer believes that the amount of time and attention which the House of Commons now bestows upon the Indian Accounts is adequate. The annual debates upon the Indian Budget, as it is termed, is described in the House as a nuisance and, out of it, as a combination of scandal and farce. Sir H. Fowler's remark that the House of Commons is never more crowded than when questions arise which affect the interests of India is, in the first place, inaccurate. True, there was a full House in February of last year to hear the debate, and his own sonorous eloquence, on the cotton duties. But it is notorious that, so far as the House of Commons was concerned, the paramount question on that occasion was not whether the Government of India would have its way, but whether Lancashire would triumph and the Government at home suffer a defeat. Debates have taken place since then upon the cotton duties, the retention of Chitral, and the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar. Did not these questions, to mention no others, affect the interests of India? And will Sir Henry Fowler maintain that on these occasions the House of Commons was crowded? But even if his remark had been accurate, it would still have been irrelevant. The purpose of Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment was to obtain a more systematic and effectual scrutiny of the Indian Accounts. The present scrutiny is neither effectual nor systematic. A series of Blue-books and White-papers is laid before Parliament, a single evening is set apart for a listless debate when the Session has reached its eleventh hour, and a resolution is submitted to the effect that the revenues of India in the year ending seventeen months ago was so much, and the expenditure so much. Lord G. Hamilton said that the amendments of which notice had been given were purely academic in character. One would like to know his candid opinion of the belated resolution which he himself had to submit. Sir Henry Fowler, whose zeal got the better of his discretion, represented Sir W. Wedderburn as saying that a mass of figures was thrown on the Table of the House without anything to guide the House as to their meaning. Sir W. Wedderburn said nothing of the kind. Neither he nor anybody else denies that the usual papers upon the Accounts and Estimates are presented to Parliament. What the Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee said was that the House of Commons had no guidance in deciding whether the explanations of the Secretary of State were, or were not, satisfactory. The "Explanatory Memorandum," which was distributed this year only two days before the debate came on, is not always so absurdly late. But late or early the "Explanatory "Memorandum" itself stands in need of explanation. Undoubtedly one of the reasons why the House of Commons takes so little interest in the Indian Budget arises from the obscurity and complexity of the subject, coupled with the fact that the information which is laid before the House is, in kind, superficial, and, in form, half-baked. Mr. B. L. Cohen's notions of "ideal perfection" are of interest to only one person in the world. But the language employed by Sir Henry Fowler and Lord George Hamilton was of the nature of objections, not so much to any particular proposal for the scrutiny of the Indian Accounts by the House of Commons, as to the theory that the House of Commons should undertake such a scrutiny at all. The Indian Government, according to Lord G. Hamilton, is doing its work well in controlling expenditure, and the wisest thing which the House of Commons can do is to leave it alone. But, if so, why continue the annual farce, or scandal, of the Budget debate? Why not leave the whole field of financial administration, in form as well as in fact, to the Government of India?

Secretaries of State, or some of them, would no

doubt be glad to forego the tedious and futile ceremony, as they regard it, of the Budget discussion. But they have not the power, though they have the disposition, and the point is that, so long as the present duty of the House of Commons with regard to the Indian Accounts exists, the duty ought to be satisfactorily discharged. Sir W. Wedderburn said, and said truly, that the people of India complain that we neither give them a voice in their own affairs, nor attend to their affairs ourselves. Yet we stand to them in a fiduciary relationship, and, as Mr. John Morley said at Leeds last June, if the members of the House of Commons are anything, they are the guardians of the interests of the unrepresented taxpayers of India. Sir H. Fowler implied throughout his speech that Sir W. Wedderburn's proposal was to confer upon the House of Commons control over Indian expenditure identical in kind and in degree with its control over British expenditure. Sir H. Fowler actually permitted himself to speak of it as a proposal that the House of Commons should undertake the control of the whole expenditure and policy of the Government of India, and a proposal to burden the machinery of Parliament with responsibility for all the details of Indian administration. Language of this kind was not merely extravagant, but also completely beside the mark. Sir W. Wedderburn had stated more than once that he proposed to lay no new duty upon the House of Commons, but only to secure the due discharge of an existing duty. The Select Committee which he suggested was to be formed on the model, without slavishly imitating the methods, of the Public Accounts Committee. This Committee, according to Sir H. Fowler himself, has no more control over the expenditure of the United Kingdom than it has over the expenditure of a particular railway company. Why, then, did Sir H. Fowler proceed to magnify to such grotesque proportions the scope of the proposal contained in the Amendment? Scrutiny of accounts is one thing. Control over expenditure is another thing. The purpose of the Select Committee proposed by Sir W. Wedderburn was, as the terms of his Amendment stated, to examine and report on the Indian Accounts for the information of Parliament. He suggested that the chief materials for the Committee might be provided in a special report on the financial condition of India, supplied early in each Session by the Government of India, and based on the debates in the Legislative Council. Sir W. Wedderburn added that if amendments and divisions on the Indian Budget were permitted in the Legislative Council, the Committee would have distinct issues to examine and report upon to the House of Commons. Such were the outlines of a scheme which its author offered to lay in fuller detail before the Secretary of State, and which might well form the basis of an improvement upon the present desultory and ill-informed discussion. Sir Charles Dilke, who pointed out that a similar proposal had received the support of Mr. Fawcett and Lord Randolph Churchill, advocated the appointment of a Committee partly on the ground that it would elicit facts favourable to the Government of India, partly on the ground that it would conciliate public feeling in India. But it was to no purpose. Those who heard, and those who took part in, the debate were outvoted by a party majority summoned by the party Whips. One thing, however, is certain. The proposal will survive this defeat. Lord G. Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler make a great mistake if they imagine that the relations of the House of Commons with the taxpayers of India can be permanently determined by the wishes of the India Office and of bureaucratic officials. The final decision lies with British electors who are realising more and more their duty to India.

WORDSWORTH: HIS PRESENT AND FUTURE INFLUENCE.[1]

In the parlour of a little inn in one of the remoter islands off the west coast of Scotland, a small gathering of Englishmen were trying to forget the comfortless drizzling rain outside that was the cause of their involuntary companionship. Topics started under these discouraging circumstances ran a short course, but not a merry one; and intervals of chilly silence had become not infrequent when some one hit upon the happy expedient of abusing Wordsworth. All of the party would have claimed to be men of culture, interested in literature and in things of the mind; most of them were graduates of some distinction. But all save one were agreed in declaring that they could see little or nothing to admire in Wordsworth, and they were heartily supported by the solitary Scotchman present, who, the more to commend his opinion to the rest, assured them that he sometimes wrote verses himself. The one dissentient felt, like Wordsworth's poet, "weak as is a "breaking wave" in the face of such a combined and self-confident assault, though for himself he was "contented if he might enjoy" the things which the others did *not* understand. He knew, for instance, that nothing had helped him to fix the peculiar and intense charm of the region in which he was then staying as that simple but exquisitely musical couplet of Wordsworth:

> "Breaking the silence of the seas
> Among the farthest Hebrides,"

and that those lines would henceforth be woven for him indissolubly with the memories of that enchanted coast. But how interpret these things to others who felt them not? So in despair he fell back upon the argument from authority, and pointed out that when, as was the case with Wordsworth, the best judges were all agreed in placing him somewhere among the very greatest English poets, their positive judgment must outweigh all negations. "If we "fail to appreciate a classic, we only show our own "limitations—nothing more." It was not a conciliatory argument, and it failed to be convincing to the hearers, who claimed the right to private judgment in literary, not less than in religious and political matters, as an inalienable privilege. Yet the argument was sound, and deserves the consideration of all who wish to acquire a literary taste that is worth having. Intellectual humility is one

[1] "The Works of William Wordsworth." Edited by William Knight. Sixteen Vols. (London: Macmillan).

of the first conditions of real intellectual advance. If the consensus of experienced critics affirms greatness in a poet, it must be there. Let us not too noisily proclaim our own incapacity. It is better to be patient and to try whether a little study will not sharpen our insight into a genius that has not attracted us at first.

The reasons of Wordsworth's comparative unpopularity with the average man are not difficult to understand. The simplicity of some of his poems tells against him with a large class of shallow people, who, having read those poems in infancy and having, as they think, grown out of them, never return to the poet to read him further. Then, his deliberate avoidance of a special poetic diction alienates that large class of readers for whom the chief difference between poetry and prose consists in the substitution of words like "steed" for words like "horse." It has also had the unquestionable result of revealing the prosaic character of parts of his work; prosaic passages abound in nearly all poets, but in most their prosaic quality is disguised, in Wordsworth it is almost obtruded upon us. An amusing instance of the almost wilful perversity with which he disdains ordinary poetic artifice occurs in the ninth book of "The Prelude":—

> "Pointed upon occasion to the site
> Of Romorentin, home of ancient kings,
> To the imperal edifice of Blois,
> Or to that rural castle, *name now slipped*
> *From my remembrance,* where a lady lodged,
> By the first Francis wooed, and bound to him
> In chains of mutual passion, from the tower,
> As a tradition of the country tells,
> Practised to commune with her royal knight
> By cressets and love-beacons, intercourse
> 'Twixt her high-seated residence and his
> Far off at Chambord on the plain beneath."

The bathos of the italicised words goes far to ruin the passage; but if we would realise the wantonness of the candour that led to their insertion, we have only to reflect how often Milton heightens the dignity of his verse by leaving an allusion in learned obscurity. Again, Wordsworth has been injured by the excessive quantity of his writing. Even so loyal a disciple as Matthew Arnold believed that his master ought to be read in "Selections." And, lastly, he wrote much philosophical poetry; and though philosophical poetry is as legitimate as poetry of the emotions, it appeals to far fewer minds. As Mr. Aubrey de Vere has pointed out, you cannot care for patriotic poetry unless you possess the sentiment of patriotism, nor for love poetry unless you possess the sentiment of love; neither can you care for philosophical poetry unless you have an interest in philosophy.

All these causes have fought against Wordsworth's influence, which is yet surely and steadily growing. The historical importance of his work is, of course, a different thing from its present or future influence; but the fact that the historical importance is now fully recognised and understood by all competent critics of literature is itself a help to the influence. Other poets loved nature before Wordsworth. We have grown out of the mistake of boasting that the love of nature is a discovery of modern times. But no poet before Wordsworth so fully interpreted the message of nature—not on all sides, but at least on her more beneficent sides—to man, or taught him the value of communion with nature: no poet before or since possessed to the like extent Wordsworth's "healing power." Partly in direct teaching that "healing power" is shown, as in the famous "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality," or in the not less magnificent "Ode to Duty," or the "Ode composed upon an evening of extraordinary splendour and beauty"; partly in the pathos ("not declamatory passion," it has been well said, "but passion steadied by its own weight") of his human stories, of "Michael" and "Margaret" and "The Leech-Gatherer"; still more, perhaps, in the haunting melody or illuminating radiance of single lines or couplets sounding or flashing suddenly out of the midst of some undistinguished passage, and thenceforward echoing or shining on in the heart for ever.

The publication of Professor Knight's laborious and exhaustive edition of the poet's writings in prose and verse is a welcome sign that the interest in Wordsworth is fully maintained in England, at a time when the "return to Byron" is being proclaimed by certain literary critics with ingenious advertisement. Still more welcome are the indications that the indifference with which Wordsworth has hitherto been regarded on the Continent is coming to an end. Very noteworthy is the publication in the present year of a lengthy, interesting, and discriminating study of "The Prelude" by M. Emile Legouis (*La Jeunesse de William Wordsworth:* Paris, Masson). Théophile Gautier said that he had only read one line of Wordsworth, and that line—"And spires whose silent finger points to heaven"—was, oddly enough, not Wordsworth's at all, but Coleridge's, and printed in quotation marks in "The Excursion." Edmond Scherer, who also differed from his countrymen in his estimate of Byron, wrote a wise and discerning essay upon Wordsworth some years ago. But M. Legouis's study seems to mark a new stage. It will be curious if English students of poetry learn for the first time from a Frenchman to set its true value upon "The Prelude." Fascinating as a biography, and unique as the history of the growth of a poet's mind under the influence of nature, of books, of companionship, and of stirring external events, the poem is also resplendent with noble lines, some of which (*e.g.*, "France standing on the top of golden hours") are famous enough, whilst others have not yet received their due meed of honour and remembrance. Such are (to quote only from one of the fourteen books, the third) the lines that describe the face of Newton's statue in the chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge:

> "The marble index of a mind for ever
> Voyaging through strange seas of thought, alone;"

or those that condemn the Cambridge of his day—

> "And blind Authority beating with his staff
> The child that might have led him,"

and contrast it with

> "that glorious time
> When Learning, like a stranger, come from far,
> Sounding thro' Christian lands her trumpet, roused
> Peasant and king."

RÂJA YOGA.[1]

Those who have had the good fortune to hear the Swâmi Vivekânanda lecture speak much of the charm of his personality and the impressiveness of his delivery. The printed page is necessarily less attractive than the spoken word, but these lectures are nevertheless eminently readable; the style is lucid, vivacious, full of conversational idiom, yet rising on occasion to eloquence. The culture and earnestness of the Swâmi, and above all the vow of renunciation which attests the depth of his convictions, claim for his doctrine a respectful and sympathetic hearing.

Râja Yoga, or Royal Yoga, is defined as "the "science of conquering the internal nature, for the "purpose of freeing the Purusa, or in other words "realising the Divinity in every being." A brief analysis of the lectures, given as far as possible in the Swâmi's own words, may be useful. Râja Yoga, we are told, proposes to put before humanity a practical, a scientifically worked out, method of reaching the highest truth (p. 5). The method is concentration upon the mind itself. Anything that is secret and mysterious in Indian systems of Yoga should be rejected. All mystery-mongering weakens the human brain. Through it the science of Yoga has been well-nigh destroyed (p. 12). The first step in Râja Yoga is Yama—non-killing, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence, and non-receiving of any gifts. Next is Niyama — cleanliness, contentment, mortification, study, and self-surrender to God (p. 17). Thirdly comes Asana, posture, learning to have a firm, erect seat. Next comes Prânâyâma, learning to control the vital forces in one's own body. The control of the nerves of another, as in hypnotism or faith-healing, is reprehensible and dangerous. It is not really controlling the brain-centres by the power of one's own will, but is, as it were, stunning the patient's mind for a time by sudden blows which another's will delivers to it (p. 64). Pratyâhâra is learning to control the mind completely: it is a long work, requiring a continuous struggle for years (p. 68). Dhârâna is holding the mind to certain points. Those who want to be Yogis must take up one idea, make that one idea their life, dream of it, think of it, live on it (p. 71). All these steps are intended to bring us scientifically to Dhyâna and Samâdhi. When the mind has been trained to remain fixed on one point, internal or external, there comes to it the power of flowing in an unbroken current towards that point. This state is called Dhyâna. When this power is so much intensified as to be able to reject the external power of perception, and remain meditating only on the internal part, the meaning, that state is Samâdhi, super-consciousness. This meditative state is the highest state of existence (p 83).

This is not the place to attempt a discussion of the Swâmi's religious and philosophical doctrines, still less to propound an estimate of their value. It will be enough to set down, in no captious spirit, some of the objections that suggest themselves to a Western critic. First, the Swâmi apparently draws a distinction between the evidence for Christianity and the evidence for his own doctrine (p. 3). All religion, he says, is based on experience, but the Christian rests his belief on an experience recorded to have happened to others in times past, whilst Yoga philosophy invites us to try its method and enjoy the experience for ourselves. But the Christian who has any vital belief in his own religion rests it in precisely the same way upon his own experience, which he regards as more decisive for himself than any external evidence. This was the spirit in which Tennyson wrote ("In Memorian," cxxiv.):—

> "If e'er when faith had fall'n asleep,
> I heard a voice 'believe no more,'
> And heard an ever-breaking shore,
> That tumbled in the Godless deep;
> A warmth within the breast would melt
> The freezing reason's colder part,
> And like a man in wrath the heart
> Stood up and answered 'I have felt'."

Secondly, there is a good deal of unproved assertion, very confidently made as if it were quite self-evident. Here are two examples from page 96. "There was "an old solution that man after death remained the "same, that all his good sides, minus his evil sides, "remained for ever. . . . This theory, on the face "of it, is absurd and puerile, because it cannot be. "There cannot be good without evil, or evil without "good." Again, "Every motion is in a circle. . . . "A straight line, infinitely projected, must end in a "circle. Therefore, this idea that the destiny of "man is progression ever forward and forward, and "never stopping, is absurd." A physical analogy transferred to the spiritual sphere is here treated as a proof. Thirdly, nothing could be more emphatic than the Swâmi's assertion, "There is no mystery "in what I preach," nothing more decisive than his condemnation of all "mystery-mongering." After this the chapter on "powers" in the Yoga Aphorisms inflicts a shock upon the reader. What is the Swâmi's own attitude towards the Aphorisms which he there expounds? Lastly, whilst it would be easy to quote noble and splendid sayings both from the Aphorisms and from the Swâmi's own teaching, the doubt arises whether, in what is distinctively Oriental, any valuable contribution is made to religious thought. Cannot anything that is of solid value be paralleled at once from Western thought, from Plato and Aristotle, to say nothing of Spinoza and other modern philosophers? It is the more necessary to insist on this doubt, because if most minds are unduly conservative and unreasonably repelled by what is new and strange, others are strongly attracted by it, and never so much as when the new brings with it subtle reminiscences of the old.

[1] "Yoga Philosophy." Lectures delivered in New York, Winter of 1895-96, by the "Swâmi Vivekânanda" on Râja Yoga, or Conquering the Internal Nature. Also Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms with Commentaries. (London and Bombay: Longmans.)

The *Daily Chronicle* of August 20th contained an interesting article on "Railways in India." Referring to the guaranteed railways the writer said: "Some twenty years ago the Government might have purchased these railways under the contract at a very different figure from that which they will have to pay when the next option falls due (in a few years' time). A well-known financial expert has calculated the present loss to the Government of India on this account alone at £800,000 annually."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons on August 13th may be said to have proved that the general public are more keenly interested than members of Parliament are in Indian affairs. The Strangers' Gallery was crowd d. But on the floor of the House itself the maximum attendance was 22, falling sometimes to 12. As 144 members (including the tellers) took part in the division on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment, it is obvious that most of those who voted had not heard the debate. The solitary occupant of the Front Opposition Bench was Sir Henry Fowler. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir Matthew White Ridley and two or three other Ministers were present to support Lord George Hamilton for a short time, but their interest or patience was soon exhausted.

A correspondent who was present in the House during the debate writes: The bare benches were a silent yet eloquent refutation of the oft-reiterated fiction that every member of the House of Commons is a member for India. The picture of India's present and future prosperity, as painted by Lord G. Hamilton, was indeed bright and alluring. But its fanciful and picturesque colouring assumed an almost sombre hue by contrast with the picture presented by his predecessor in office. An interesting incident was the friendly conversation between Lord G. Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler pending the Speaker's return "after the usual interval." It was a fitting prelude to what followed. A visitor, and late arrival at the House, who failed to recognise the speaker of the moment—Sir Henry Fowler—was to be pardoned for imagining, as he did, that he was listening to a speech from a member of the Government. The duty of an Opposition may not invariably be to oppose. But can it be said to be the duty of an ex-Minister to act exclusively as a hostile critic of individual members of his own party while, at the same time, he merely echoes or endorses the statements of his successor?

In the division on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment the voting was 30 "for" and 110 "against." These figures, of course, do not include the "tellers," who were Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. H. J. Wilson for the minority, and Sir W. Walrond and Mr. Anstruther for the majority. The minority included, apart from the tellers, 20 members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, namely:—Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and Messrs. Bayley, Burns, Caldwell, Cameron, Dalziel, Hogan, Horniman, Jones, Lewis, Lough, Maden, Roberts, Shaw, Souttar, Stanhope, Stuart, Ure, Carvell Williams, and Yoxall. Among the other members who voted for Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment were Mr. Timothy M. Healy, Mr. Maurice Healy, and Mr. Michael Davitt. The majority against the amendment included Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. T. E. Ellis, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. J. Chamberlain, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. George Curzon, Sir John Gorst, Sir Andrew Scoble, and—need we add?—Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree.

It may be mentioned that Sir W. Wedderburn, having moved his amendment, was thereby precluded from speaking on any other amendment to the motion to go into Committee.

The notices of Motion, now standing in the Orderbook of the House of Commons for next Session, include the following which have reference to India:

General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan,—East India (Native Army)—To call attention to the defective system of officering the native army of India, as regards its British officers; and to move a Resolution.

On going into Committee of Supply:—

General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan,—On Army Estimates, to call attention to the inadequacy, for purposes of Imperial and Colonial defence, of our present military system; and to move a Resolution suggesting means for its expansion.

General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan,—On Army Estimates, to call attention to the administration of the Ordnance Factories, as regards the supply of guns and small arms for the army and navy; and to move a Resolution.

Mr. H. J. Wilson has given notice that he will move for a Return showing for the last ten years the acreage under poppy in India; the amount of advances to the cultivators for crude opium; the quantity of opium produced in the factories, distinguishing between the Behar and Benares agencies; the quantity exported to China and other countries; the quantity of Malwa and other opium purchased by the Indian Government; and the quantity which in any other way came under the cognisance of the Indian Government.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, as will be seen from the report which we print elsewhere, adjourned on August 4th until January next. It is anticipated that the Commission will shortly issue an important volume containing the first section of the evidence—that, namely, which deals with the "financial machinery" of Indian administration—together with a formal report and certain documents on specific financial questions. On Wednesday, July 29th, the Commission heard Dr. Bahadurji's evidence on the Indian Medical Service. Dr. Bahadurji, we may add, created an excellent impression by the knowledge and grasp of his subject which he displayed, and by the manner in which he gave his evidence.

The remarkable evidence given by Lord Wolseley before the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure excited a chorus of condemnation from the English press. The *Spectator*, for example, after making all possible excuses for his "unfortunate and entirely uncalled-for remarks," said: "Considering the sensitiveness of all soldiers on the question of military spirit, and their just indignation at anything approaching a reflection upon their ability to go anywhere and do anything, it was a most deplorable circumstance that the value of the Indian troops should be depreciated by the Commander-in-Chief." The *Manchester Guardian* observed that "it would be charitable to suppose that Lord Wolseley did not mean what he said, and lost his head in his desire to defend the policy of the Government with regard to the Indian troops in Egypt." It is to be noted that Lord G. Hamilton, in his Budget speech, went out of his way to say that in the opinion of the India Council "the native army was fit to go anywhere and to meet any troops in the world."

What we may assume to be Lord Wolseley's reply to animadversions upon his remarks was circulated by Reuter's Agency, which "has reason to know" that the Commander-in-Chief entertains the highest opinion of the fighting qualities and efficiency of the Indian army. Further, "when Lord Wolseley some years ago published his views on the subject, he then expressed his praise in the highest terms, stating that English and Indian cavalry could with ease ride over hordes of Cossacks. This opinion he still holds. It is his belief that, for the purposes for which it exists, the Indian army is as perfect as it can be." It was further stated that the extracts of the recent evidence published in the press were misleading. Lord Wolseley might well have repented his indiscretion, (or corrected the misleading report) a little more directly.

The Queen has approved the appointment of Mr. Robert Smith Aikman, of the Indian Civil Service, who now holds the appointment of Acting Judge in the High Court of Allahabad, to be a judge of that court.

The following letter from Mrs. Besant, which was printed in the *St. James's Gazette* of August 7th, discloses an aspect of the "condition of India" question which Secretaries and ex-Secretaries of State are apt to overlook in debates on the Indian Budget:—

"Terrible suffering is being endured from starvation at the present time in the Central Provinces of India, and, as it prevails over a limited area, it attracts little attention and less relief. Private efforts are being made to meet the distress without appealing to the heavily burdened Government, and a comparatively small sum would be adequate to carry the people over the worst time. Coming directly from English sympathy, it would spread through the district a friendly and brotherly feeling. As I can get food distributed without any cost of organisation, every shilling given means food for about twenty people; and I ask for a few charitable gifts to save men, women, and children from slowly dying."

Mr. Rudyard Kipling's new volume of ballads is expected to appear in October.

Sir Richard Temple has completed his autobiographical work setting forth the narrative of his long public life in India and at home. It will be published in the autumn.

It is officially announced that an open competitive examination for admission to the Civil Service of India will be held in London, commencing on August 3rd, 1897. The number of persons to be selected at this examination will be announced hereafter. No person will be admitted to compete from whom the secretary, Civil Service Commission, has not received, on or before May 31st, 1897, an application on the prescribed form accompanied by a list of the subjects in which the candidate desires to be examined.

"Ranjitsinhji," wrote a cricket reporter on August 24th, "is finishing up the season in amazing form, and that he will be top of the batting averages scarcely admits of doubt. With at the most, four more matches to play, he is well in front of everyone, beating Captain Wynyard by about eight and a-half in the averages, and being nearly five hundred ahead of Abel in the aggregate of runs. The substantial lead he now holds is due in great measure to his wonderful cricket last week at Brighton. In the two Sussex matches he actually made 430 runs, scoring 40 and 165 against Lancashire and 100 and not out 125 against Yorkshire. In both matches he had the satisfaction of saving his side from defeat. If he had only made average scores Sussex would inevitably have been beaten on both occasions. Ranjitsinhji has won a splendid record for the year, having scored 2,579 runs with an average of only the smallest fraction less than 60."

The Secretary of State for India has appointed Mr. E. Grant Burls to be Director-General of Stores at the India Office. Mr. Burls was formerly Deputy Director-General. Mr. Robert George Crozier is promoted to the office of Deputy Director-General in the place of Mr. Burls.

MR. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The *New Age*, under the editorship of Mr. A. E. Fletcher, formerly editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, is publishing a series of articles upon "Men who ought to be in Parliament." The subject of the sketch which appeared on August 20th was Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee. We take the following extracts from an exceedingly interesting article:—

The annual farce of the Indian Budget turns our minds to the great Eastern Dependency, and prompts the regret that Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee has not yet found a seat in the House of Commons. It was a profound misfortune that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji lost his seat at the general election, and the effects of that misfortune will be severely felt until he be replaced in the House. Not but that Mr. Dadabhai is working with all his force for India outside the House! for he "bates no jot of heart or hope, but still bears up and steers right onward," "in Liberty's defence, his noble task," "guided by faith and matchless fortitude," "of which all India rings from side to side."

It may be too much to say that if the electors of Barrow-in-Furness had returned Mr. Bonnerjee at the last general election, Mr. Dadabhai's place would have been filled. But when we look around for a real successor to the most distinguished and most generally representative and trusted Indian of our time, our eye is stayed upon Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee.

Yet how different are the two men! Mr. Dadabhai small and gentle, with the gentleness of age and experience; Mr. Bonnerjee, a powerful man, six feet in his stockings, impressive with the well-preserved and wisely guided energy of comparative youth at little over fifty. Mr. Dadabhai with the smooth and tactful speech and the quiet endurance of Ulysses; Mr. Bonnerjee with the fighting strength and skill of a civil Achilles. At the same time there are notable points of likeness between these remarkable men. The native blood that circulates in the veins of both of them manifests itself in character-

istic ways. If Mr. Dadabhai is a representative Parsi, Mr. Bonnerjee exhibits all the better qualities of the trained Hindu; and both of them know how to reconcile the warmest loyalty to England with the warmest patriotism for India. Both have always been frankly outspoken in their criticisms of English rule in India, and neither of them has ever condescended to carping or unfair attack, any more than to hollow flatteries. Such an attitude of mind on the part of the ablest men of India ought to be invaluable to us if we would only take advantage of it; and nowhere ought to be more effective for good than on the floor of the House at Westminster. Like Mr. Dadabhai, Mr. Bonnerjee is known and trusted throughout the length and breadth of the Peninsula, and he knows even better than Mr. Dadabhai the present feeling of his countrymen on all the important points of current discussion. No more valuable member could be placed in the House of Commons by a British constituency at the present time; and no member would do his constituents higher honour or more effective service.

For, again like Mr. Dadabhai, Mr. Bonnerjee is not a mere home-keeping Indian. On the contrary, he is as much at home at Croydon as he is at Calcutta, and his training has been largely influenced by English contact. Once more like Mr. Dadabhai, Mr. Bonnerjee is a self-made man—such a man as Englishmen are especially delighted to honour. He first planted his foot on the ladder by gaining a scholarship, which took him to London to study law. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn some thirty years ago; and his subsequent rise to the leading position he has long held at the Calcutta Bar shows the stuff he is made of and the diligence of his early preparation. It is a striking tribute to his forensic ability that he can throw down his briefs any day in Calcutta, establish himself at Kidderpore House at Croydon for six months, and return to find his table loaded with fresh briefs the moment he arrives home. To the London barrister such a fact speaks with a cogency that is more readily understood than described. It means mastery undisputed; more than that—frankly acknowledged, and acknowledged indisputably. It implies ability and confidence of the rarest character. It stamps Mr. Bonnerjee as one of the very foremost of modern advocates, and a man pre-eminently qualified to represent and to vindicate the rights of those that place their trust in him. But what we were mainly concerned for was to point to Mr. Bonnerjee's touch with English thought and feeling. Not only did he go through the usual course of preparation for his professional career in London, but, if we are not mistaken, he at the same time had experience of journalism. We believe we are right in claiming him as a quondam confrère. In the less prosperous days of his student life here, he acted as London correspondent, or at any rate contributed largely to the columns of a well-known provincial newspaper. Since these days he has always kept in close touch with English life. As we have indicated, he keeps a permanent residence at Croydon, and he is well-known in London. His candidature at Barrow showed how fully he is abreast of English politics, and next time he tries conclusions at Barrow it is safe to predict that the few hundred votes that put Mr. Cayzer at the top of the poll will then be cast for Mr. Bonnerjee.

Mr. Bonnerjee enjoys the unique distinction of having been chosen as First President of the Indian National Congress, when it assembled at Bombay in December, 1885. He shares with Mr. Dadabhai the further distinction of having been elected for the second time President, at the Allahabad meeting in December, 1892. There could be no higher testimony to the esteem in which Mr. Bonnerjee is held in point of character and ability by the most progressive of his countrymen. That first meeting at Bombay was assuredly, as Mr. Bonnerjee then called it, and as all the world must now acknowledge, a "great and memorable gathering," and Mr. Bonnerjee did a man's part towards its accomplishment.

It is unhappily notorious that our officials are disastrously ignorant of the real feeling of the people; and it is correspondingly clear that no better clue to that feeling is available in the existing circumstances than the voice of the National Congress. It is also as plain as a pike-staff that the natural effects of the education we have laboured to promote in India, directly or indirectly, must have their free course; and it is quite certain to anyone outside officialism that they will eventually justify themselves.

We trust the time is not far distant when some long-sighted and patriotic constituency will do itself the honour, and its country the service, of placing Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee on the Liberal benches of the House of Commons.

THE "BUDGET" DEBATE: OFFICIAL RECORD.

The following official record of the debate on the Indian Budget appeared in the Parliamentary "Votes and Proceedings" for August 13th:

37. East India Revenue Accounts,—Order for Committee thereupon read;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair":—

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, "with a view to the effectual discharge of its existing duty in respect of the finances of India, this House is of opinion that the East India Accounts should each year be examined and reported on by a Select Committee of the House, thus *mutatis mutandis* assimilating the practice as regards Indian Accounts to that followed, by means of the Public Accounts Committee, in respect of the Accounts of the United Kingdom"—(*Sir William Wedderburn*)—instead thereof:

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question":—The House divided: Ayes 110, Noes 30.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Considered in Committee:

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it appears, by the Accounts laid

before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1895, was Rx. 95,187,429; that the total Expenditure in India and in England charged against the Revenue was Rx. 94,494,319; that there was a Surplus of Revenue over Expenditure of Rx 693,110; and that the Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works not charged against Revenue was Rx.4,446,231. (Secretary, Lord George Hamilton.)

Resolution to be reported.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

EVIDENCE OF LORD WOLSELEY.

REMARKABLE OBSERVATIONS ON THE INDIAN ARMY.

Lord Wolseley was examined before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure at the India Office on July 29th. Lord Welby presided. The Commissioners present were:—Lord Welby, Mr. Jackson, M.P., Sir Donald Stewart, Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. Naoroji, Sir R. H. Knox, Mr. R. G. P. Mowbray, and Mr. Colin Campbell (secretary).

Lord Wolseley said he did not think that the organisation of the Indian Army was far beyond what experience had shown to be required. We merely sent what the Indian Government asked for. It was a very serious inconvenience to our military organisation, and it put a great difficulty in the way of recruiting. The larger number of recruits we had to enlist for India every year added to the cost and *pro tanto* increased our difficulties. The Indian Government was not in a position to plead that the army exceeded the requirements of India and would not assent to a reduction. His experience of India was that it produced a great number of the ablest officers in the Army, but they knew very little of the organisation of the Imperial Army all over the world, and they were more especially ignorant of the difficulties we had of obtaining recruits and of keeping up the number established by Parliament every year. He was satisfied with the organisation by which recruits were furnished to India, because he could remember the old system. The present system of recruiting was infinitely superior. The troops now sent to India annually were about 12,000. In the old days when a lad came and said that he was 20 he was accepted; but now they had physical equivalents for the ages of recruits of 18, 19, and 20. The age which the India Government insisted upon for recruits was that they should not be less than 20. The majority of soldiers who left for India had had about 18 months' service. He thought the recruits for India would be a great nuisance in case of emergency. The emergencies in regard to England were, first of all, internal riot. In a riot in a town they would never think of sending recruits with troops to go into the streets. In case of invasion they would be a positive detriment, because useful non-commissioned officers would have to be left with them. In case of a threatened invasion the men who had had a year's training would be put into fortifications along with the Volunteers. The young boys intended to be sent to India every year would be in the way, in a great measure, and they could only be utilised in depôts and forts. These young soldiers would not be any addition to the fighting force, and he did not think that any serious rebate should be made on the charge to India on that account.

Mr. BUCHANAN: But after a year's training, would not they be good fighting material?—They would do exactly what our volunteers would do. No doubt, in the case of a long war those young soldiers would be useful; but we should not send them out to were the war was going on. We should still have to send out recruits to India.

Continuing, the witness said that the recruiting for the Indian Army indirectly strengthened the home force, but our army was really a great reserve for the army in India; and we were prepared to send out the whole of our army to India if it were required. At present we had annually between 30,000 and 40,000 recruits, and but for India 16,000 recruits would be ample for our requirements, and we should have a better set of recruits. Against that very improbable event of invasion we had the very great difficulty of supplying India with a large number of troops. We could always raise troops in England, but not in India. The men trained in India were inferior men. No doubt the short service had brought about efficiency in the Army. The men who won the great battles in India were between 21 and 30. Short service was established because we could not obtain troops to enlist on long service. The short service was very popular, and we now had no difficulty in getting the 30,000 or 35,000 recruits which we annually required. The men were more contented because they were naturally better treated and enabled to quit the service if they disliked it at the end of seven years. Short service would have been postponed for many years had it not been for the necessity of sending 10,000 or 12,000 men to the Mutiny in India. Before the Mutiny there were 36,000 European troops in India, and now there were little over double that number. The younger soldiers in India were invalided in a less proportion than the older ones. After the soldier had been eight years in India the sooner he was got rid of, in the interests of India, the better. The number of invalided men who died after eight years' service was very large indeed. After eight years' service they were bound to give a man a pension, seeing that he had spent the best years of his life in the service. He did not think a man should serve in India longer than six or seven years.

What is your idea generally as to what India should pay of the military expenditure?—I think India should pay everything connected with the army. Supposing India did not belong to us, it would be the difference between the establishment that we should have then and what we have now.

Mr. NAOROJI: Is it not for the maintenance of British rule that these armies are there?—Quite so.

Mr. CAINE: Do you think that India ought to pay for Aden, which is used for other purposes than India?—But it is exclusively used for India. It was established before the Suez Canal was there.

Mr. BUCHANAN: If India was withdrawn from the British Empire would you abandon Aden?—We should take time to consider that.

Mr. CAINE: Surely, if we were at war with Russia, under existing conditions, we could use the canal with perfect safety, and that is the contingency with regard to India?—Quite so. I may say that Russia is not likely to go to war with us without having strong naval allies.

Is it a fair adjustment of the expense for Aden that India should pay 277,000 tens of rupees while Great Britain only pays 16,000 tens of rupees?—I think that as India pays very little for the Navy, and as the Navy is the defence for Aden, it is quite fair.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Do you say that India ought to pay every penny of military cost which this country would not have incurred but for India?—Yes.

But is not the keeping up of the forces necessarily an obligation to a certain extent upon the whole Empire?—I do not think so. The whole English Army that we maintain in England is a reserve to be sent to India whenever she requires it, for which reserve India pays nothing.

Should India pay every farthing of military expense?—Yes; and the Navy, too.

Mr. CAINE: Surely the Indian Army is quite as much a reserve force for our own emergencies?—We should not like to put our Indian troops in front of European soldiers. I should not like to fight France or Germany or any other army with Indian troops.

Mr. NAOROJI: Is not the India Army maintained for British purposes?—But you assume that it is no value to India.

But you assume that it is for the benefit of India only?—My views are that India never existed as India at all until we went there. It was a conglomeration of fighting States where Muhammadans were cutting the throats of Hindus, and everything that is worth having by India has been derived from English rule.

Mr. MOWBRAY: Do you think it would be possible materially to reduce the number of troops in England, having regard to foreign possible complications and our general Imperial obligations, putting India altogether out of the question?—We should certainly reduce the Army *pro tanto*—all the forces that we have in India. We have men here always available

for India; and we keep men in India that are exclusively used for training the Army that goes to India.

Mr. JACKSON: If this reserve was not available India must keep a larger number of troops for herself?—Yes.

And the effect of this reserve here is a great economy to India?—Yes; and the best proof of that was the Indian Mutiny.

Mr. CAINE: Do you think that Eurasian regiments might take the place of British regiments?—Well, during the Mutiny I saw one Eurasian regiment, and a more useless and wretched body I never saw in my life; they would not fight and they were always grumbling.

Mr. NAOROJI: Our object in this Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country in matters in which both are interested. You say England has done so much for India that India must pay every farthing. Now let me read you a short statement.

The WITNESS: If you are going to read me a long essay on some problem I am afraid I could give no valuable reply.

Mr. NAOROJI: You say that England made India. I say that India has made England the most powerful, the richest, and the greatest country in the world.

Dr. BAHADURJI next gave evidence with reference to the medical service in India.

The Commission adjourned.

EVIDENCE OF LORD CROMER.

On Tuesday, August 4th, Lord Cromer gave evidence before the Royal Commission. Lord Welby presided, and there were present Sir Donald Stewart, Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. Colin Campbell, secretary.

Lord CROMER, in examination by the Chairman, said: I was Financial Minister in India from 1880 to 1882. With regard to Sir Edwin Collen's evidence, that matters have changed so much since 1885 that no one's experience is of value, that may be so. Of course, since 1885 there have been considerable changes of policy in the relation between Russia and England.

Is the control over Indian expenditure as complete as that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England?—Well, theoretically, a member of Council of India is very much in the same position as the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England; but there can be no doubt that the financial department in India does not obtain the same predominant position in India as in England. No doubt one of the causes of that is that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is responsible to Parliament and has to defend any measure that he proposes. But that is not the sole reason. The peculiar position in this country has been that for a great many years the Treasury was supported by one of the most powerful Ministers of the century—I allude to Mr. Gladstone. The personal element is more important in India than it would be under a Parliamentary system; but under whatever system you cannot get rid of the personal factor, which is the most important consideration. In dealing with India under whatever system you have you must depend upon the idiosyncracies of those who are in the highest positions of the country. The interest of Parliament is not always in the interest of economy; but the mere fact that a man has to defend his measure before 600 or 700 people, one-half of whom are hostile, makes him careful in what he proposes. In India the Indian Council has no such support behind it. I think I see running through the evidence given to this Commission an idea that the Indian Council consists merely of a number of heads of departments each of whom is interested in pushing his own department and nothing else. That certainly is not my conception of the Indian Council; neither did the system work in that way when I was in India. Of course every member of the Council had to be acquainted with the facts of his own department and to put forward the interests of his department, but he is certainly expected to do more than that. I regard him as a member of the Council who is collectively responsible for every act the Council undertakes. For instance, I did not always advocate the financial side of a question, but sometimes took the military view. The cardinal principle was the necessity of balancing the revenue and expenditure; and I always found every member of Council ready to give due weight to that principle. I can quite understand that if two or three members combined towards expenditure and the Viceroy supported them then certainly the financial control would be materially weakened; but I cannot say that has happened. The same thing may be said of any Government in England; if you have to adopt measures which are of advantage to the Ministry I imagine that the views of the Treasury would go to the wall.

If there was a large surplus would not each department naturally want to have a share of it instead of maintaining a considerable balance?—That is undoubtedly the case. I have to deal with exactly the same thing in Egypt. There is no doubt that India is exposed to lean years and fat years, and account must be taken of that. You may make very cautious estimates of expenditure and revenue to leave you a margin; but that does not go very far. I think an average of years was taken in India except in the case of opium, where we went upon current prices. The question of financial control must largely depend upon the general tone of the Council. I see great stress has been laid before this Commission about the power of the Viceroy; and no doubt it is very great, probably greater than that of the Prime Minister here. The Viceroy has to give unity of action to all the departments; in England there has been rather a want of this unity of action. The Viceroy sees a great many more papers, and, therefore, he can exercise more unity of action than is exercised in England. In fact, the Viceroy is very much like the Chancellor of the German Empire in bringing all the departments together; and the Viceroy sees pretty well everything of importance to a greater extent than is the case with the Prime Minister here.

Do you think that greater attention should be paid to the finances of India?—I think it is desirable; but I do not find that any one has made suggestions which are going to insure it. I look with dislike at anything which transfers the power of the financial control of India from England. I think the intention is excellent, that they want to deal justly and generously with India; but I do not think that they could take account of local considerations with real advantage to the public. I do not think that I should weaken the power of the Secretary of State as at present, because he is the natural ally of the Indian Council.

Is not the practical control of the Finance Minister very much reduced if the Viceroy takes a side against him?—It is very much impaired.

The supreme power of the Viceroy is the leading thing in the administration, and therefore unless there were powers given to the Finance Minister there could be no check upon him?—Quite so. But I do not think that any power would be of very much help to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England if all his colleagues were against him; it would be much the same in India. Broadly speaking, it would be unwise to impair the power of the Viceroy.

Do you think the composition of the Council of India could be advantageously changed?—All my experience in India and Egypt has shown me the enormous importance of selecting the right men for the right place, and it is of more importance in Oriental Governments than in England. The Indian Council consists partly of Indian officials and partly of Englishmen nominated from England. They both bring experience to bear, and I should be sorry to see that changed. But it is more easy to get the pick of the Indian civil servants into the Council than it is to get the pick of the English service into the public service of India. In Egypt we have solved the difficulty by appointing young unknown men, and the system has worked well; but that would not do for the superior appointments of India. The only plan for getting first-rate men for the Indian Council, for instance, would be to increase the pay.

If the Viceroy's tendencies are towards economy then the Financial Minister does not need further powers?—Quite so. You cannot compensate for want of frugality at the head. If the Viceroy is bent on economy and thoroughly frugal that will percolate down to the whole of the service. Let me put the analogy of what is happening in Egypt. My position is a very anomalous one; but I have not the least doubt if I had exerted my influence on the side of extravagance the Egyptian finances would not be in the position they are now; and I did not forget the military and sanitary expenditure at the same time. And so with the Viceroy; he sees that the revenue and expenditure balance, and with a bias to economy.

Should the Finance Minister be able to explain to the Secretary of State without passing his arguments through the Viceroy?—I think every member of the Council should be able

to write a confidential memorandum to the Secretary of State, not necessarily for publication—in fact, it should not be published without their consent. When I write anything to the Foreign Office marked "confidential," I know that it will not be published without my consent, and I think that should be done by every member of the Indian Council, so that the Secretary of State should be well informed. I have never had any difficulty through writing my views to the Home Government, and I think I have disagreed with every Government that I have served. Speaking generally, I am very much against managing Indian details from London, although I think the Indian Council should have very great weight in larger matters. In Egypt we have a small committee of financial advisers; but the conditions of India are very different from Egypt, and the same thing would not apply to India. The moral of the whole thing is to choose your individuals well; it does not depend so much upon the system.

You think the audit system has nothing to do with economy?—No; it insures regularity only. My view as to the home charges is this—that both Parliament and the Ministers wish to deal justly and generously with India. But I think it would be an exceedingly good thing if you could have a Court of Arbitration to deal with these matters. It is not only important that the settlement should be just, but it is of the highest importance that the natives and Europeans and the Government of India themselves should think it is so. I do not think that is the case under the present system, and there is no means of making the people of India think it is just. They think that the English view is urged with greater strength than the Indian view. Whether that is right or wrong, the mere fact that it exists is an evil; and therefore I should be glad to have some Court of Arbitration to settle such matters. Take the question as to the proportion that this country should pay towards keeping up Aden—that would be eminently fitted for a Court of Arbitration, consisting of three or five members.

Supposing Indian troops were employed, the court would decide what interest the two countries had in the expedition?—My view was that the court should be confined to those permanent military charges rather than questions of these expeditions. I should not give the Government of India power to overrule the award of the Court of Arbitration; it should only be reviewed by Parliament, if at all?

You are aware of the arrangement between England and India as to the lending of troops; so long as India is put to no extra expense she does not charge the Imperial Government?—I am afraid I cannot go into this question, because it has been a burning question lately, and perhaps it is not quite over.

Sir William Wedderburn: Do you not think that the people of India should have a voice in important financial matters?—That touches the general question of developing more or less popular institutions in India. That raises very large issues indeed. If I were asked to say whether anything of the sort should be done, I should say: See first of all how the natives of India have exercised the authority which had already been given them on the municipal boards where they have been sitting a good many years, and if I found that they had exercised those powers wisely and in the interests generally of their fellow-countrymen or the taxpayers, then I should have something to say in favour of very gradual and tentative experimental measures for giving them a voice in the affairs of India. But it is a difficult question; and I should not like to give an opinion without hearing the views of the highest officials of India on the matter. I do not say that I oppose it at all; but such a step should not be taken without consulting the highest Indian authorities.

Asked whether some check should not be put on Indian matters by members of Parliament being able to reduce the salary of the Indian Secretary, Lord Cromer replied that he had not gone into that; but he could mention a few cases where Parliamentary intervention had done harm; for instance, in the cases of the agitation against opium and the Contagious Diseases Acts. No doubt the intentions of Parliament were excellent, but on account of the want of knowledge in dealing with Indian questions its interference would probably do harm.

Mr. Naoroji said he had been advised by the Chairman to reserve his views in order to give them to the Commission as a witness, and consequently he would not put any questions to Lord Cromer.

The Commission adjourned till January next.

Reviews.

A SOCIAL REFORMER.

India; Forty Years of Progress and Reform. Being a Sketch of the Life and Times of Behramji M. Malabari. By R. P. Karkaria. (London: Henry Frowde. 1896.)

Mr. Karkaria has already done excellent service to literature by rescuing from the records of the Bombay Asiatic Society "Carlyle's Unpublished Lectures on European Literature and Culture." He now takes another step in advance in hero-worship, and presents to English readers a concise, clear, and effective sketch of the distinctive life and work of Mr. Malabari, as the central force in social progress and reform during the past generation in India. It is not for us to assign the comparative niche of greatness that Mr. Malabari is entitled to; that may well be left to the future critic. But we will not quarrel with Mr. Karkaria for adopting the view of Sir John Scott, who described our hero as "the best man that India in the course of her new development has produced." Mr. Malabari would no doubt join with us in wishing heartily that there were hundreds and thousands of men and women to whom the same general expression of admiring approval might be legitimately applied. Let us admire Mr. Malabari without assessing him and classifying him with historical precision, or attributing to him the whole, or even the largest part, of the credit for recent social advances in India. At the same time let Mr. Karkaria speak:

> "Of nothing could England be more justly proud than of having been the means of organizing this small band of (social) reformers in India, imbued not only with the literature and learning, but also with the real Christian charity, of the West. At the head of these stands the subject of our sketch, who has used all his great gifts for the advancement of the cause, the vital importance of which he was really the first to recognize, and which, but for him, it is not too much to say would never have obtained its now universal recognition. How he realized social reform as the one great task of his life, devoting to it everything in his power, and making for it sacrifices which alone stamp him as a rare character in a self-seeking age; how, from a hopeless and discredited cause, ridiculed as utterly impracticable, he gave to it its proper place as the burning question of the day, involving the happiness of millions, and changed almost entirely in its favour the current of the influential opinion which at first ran against it; and how, when he finally succeeded in rousing the authorities to a due sense of their responsibility in the matter, and in obtaining a legislative measure of relief which, though small at present, may develop later into much larger proportions; how he met the obloquy and misrepresentation of those very classes whom he had devoted his life to benefit—all this we may now proceed briefly to narrate."

Mr. Gidumal has already narrated the career of Mr. Malabari, but Mr. Karkaria will no doubt take the wind out of Mr. Gidumal's sails in these latitudes, thanks to the intervention of Mr. Frowde and the Clarendon Press. Mr. Malabari was born in 1853-4, in Baroda. Like many another notable man, he takes after a very notable mother. The glimpses of Bhikhibai afforded by Mr. Karkaria are very interesting. Mr. Malabari has duteously celebrated her in prose and verse:

"What a mother mine was!" he writes in one place; "a picture of self-sacrifice. Some people live to die; others are

prepared to die, so that they may live. My mother was one of these. She died at thirty-three, but still she lives in the memory of many who knew her. To me she has been and will be alive always. How can a mother die? There is an aroma of immortality about the word *Mother* and the idea it clothes. . . . . I carry my mother about in the spirit She is always present to me. In every good woman I see my mother; I pity every bad or ill-used woman for my mother's sake."

The death of the "sainted guide" of his chequered youth turned him into "a man at twelve" He had learned little systematically, but he had derived deep, if irregular, inspiration from the peculiar poetry of the Khialis, itinerant bards whose music and frolics he had enjoyed in the streets of Surat. He made a small income from pupils, often older than himself, and attended school in his off-hours; first, for three or four years, in Surat, and later in Bombay

"He cultivated his natural bent for literature, especially poetry, and ranged in a desultory manner over a wide field of English verse. His mastery over the language was increasing, and it is interesting to find him appreciating rationally and critically, even at that early age, most of the greatest poets of England. 'I have ranged aimlessly,' says he, 'over a very wide field of poetry, English as well as Indian; also Persian and Greek translated. As to English masters, Shakespeare was my daily companion during school days, and a long while after that. Much of my worldly knowledge I owe to this greatest of seers and practical thinkers. Milton filled me with awe. Somehow I used to feel unhappy when the turn came for "Paradise Lost." His torrent of words frightened me as much by their stateliness as by monotony. Nor could I sympathise with some of the personal teachings of this grand old singer. Wordsworth is my philosopher, Tennyson my poet. Amongst my many prizes at school I rememb r having received a bulky volume named "Selections from British Poets," carried home for me by an elder companion I used to dip into this unwieldy folio, and got to know a little of Chaucer, Spenser, and other stars, earlier as well as later, through it. At school I had Campbell for another favourite, preferred Dryden to Pope, and Scott to several of his contemporaries. Cowper and Goldsmith I have always valued as dear old schoolmasters; Byron and Burns are boon companions, when in the mood; Shelley and Keats as explorers of dreamland, who fascinate one by their subtle fancies.'"

From Surat Mr. Malabari brought with him to Bombay some Gujarati verse of his own making, and showed it to the Rev. J. Van Someron Taylor, who passed him on with it to the famous Scotch missionary, Dr. John Wilson, who took him to Sir Cawasji Jehangir, who introduced him to Mr Martin Wood, then ably conducting the *Times of India*. In 1875 the little volume of Gujarati verse—"Niti-Vinod"—was published. "In the range of Gujarati literature," says Mr. Karkaria, "it would be difficult to find a poet who, at twice or thrice Malabari's age, could display his spiritual insight and wisdom." A year later appeared his "Indian Muse in English Garb," a volume, says Mr. Karkaria, "perhaps the first of its kind to arrest attention both in India and in England." In 1878, "Wilson-Virah," a collection of lyrics, deplored the loss of Dr. Wilson. "Without the direct, though brief, contact he had with that noble character," says the biographer, "Malabari would not have been what he has become" His admirable volume on "Gujarat and the Gujaratis," rescued from the oblivion of a newspaper file, gives a vivid picture of men and manners from personal observation; and it prompts regret that the author has not produced a similar work on other provinces of India that he has visited in his regular exploratory "campaigns." "The Indian Eye on English Life" is a remarkably acute and candid survey of English ways through Indian spectacles, and is full of instruction both for Indians and for Englishmen. Mr. Malabari's translation of Professor Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures on the "Growth and Origin of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India," grew out of the common aim "to try to bring the East and the West closer, to unite them by the bonds of knowledge and sympathy." His recent treatment of "The Indian Problem" is distinguished by independence and fairness. In his latest verses, "Anubhavika" ("Experiences of Life"), his heart turns to his beloved Gujarat and the scenes of his childhood. Add to this his incessant work for some twenty years on the *Indian Spectator*, and the total forms a remarkable record of successful and useful work for a man of forty-three.

The great practical life-work of Mr. Malabari, his exertions in India and in England for the root and branch reform of infant marriage, is prominently set forth in Mr. Karkaria's pages. The Age of Consent Act, passed by Lord Lansdowne's Government, raising the legal age for the consummation of marriage from ten to twelve, "must be considered a great and beneficent achievement," and in the main it is "the result of Malabari's advocacy of social reform in England as well as India during nearly ten years."

"If true greatness is to be measured, not so much by the greatness of the results achieved as by the magnitude of the difficulties overcome, and of the obstacles removed during the effort, then the leader of Indian Social Reform must be said to be really a great man. His efforts show what could be achieved by single-minded zeal and perseverance. Even after the passing of this Act he has not been idle. He is busy urging the Government to take up the second proposal of the Committee in London, that about abolishing the English-imported law regarding the "restitution of conjugal rights." His work, moreover, is not limited to public exertions like those we have recorded. His private efforts for social reform are indefatigable. He has working committees in almost every part of the country, which help, personally, with money and influence, those who are in need of support.

Mr. Karkaria makes an excellent general impression. We should have been glad, however, if he had been more liberal with details. The dates should have been given with more fulness and exactitude. He is also extremely discursive, although many of his discursions are full of interest and go some way towards a justification of his subordinate title, "Forty years of Progress and Reform," which is far too wide for the occasion. His criticism of missionary work seems judicious, though sometimes severe. His animadversions on University defects betray an essential misunderstanding of the ends and purposes and effects of University education. His political criticisms, usually judicial and carefully balanced, are often suggestive. The following passage is too important for summary or condensation:

"That high hopes and aspirations have been created; that the educated classes are becoming dissatisfied with the present state of things; that there is a strong and a strange ferment working in certain ranks of Indian society, making for unrest and change; that instead of looking upon the English rulers as their real benefactors, they are beginning to view their actions suspiciously, seizing every opportunity of criticising and censuring, and, in some cases, of lowering the prestige of their rulers; that the race-feeling between the rulers and the ruled, instead of diminishing, has increased with the spread of literary education among our young men; that all this is more or less true at present, cannot be denied by an impartial

political observer. On the contrary, it must be mournfully admitted by every person who has the good of the Empire at heart, that the signs are getting worse, that needless acerbity is shown on both sides, and that influential mediators are sadly wanting to heal wounds which are not allowed to close. *Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice.* Everywhere and all around proofs of this abound. In schools and colleges and universities, in debating clubs and associations; in literature, spoken and written; in newspapers and pamphlets, plays and novels; in public life, in municipalities and legislative councils; in private life, in after-dinner talk and friendly converse; in short, in all departments of life, this new tendency, this mental unrest and dissatisfaction with the present order, is the one thing conspicuous, almost aggressive. Why this should be so; why the class which owes its very existence to the British rule, and from which additional stability was expected to be given to it, should seem to be uncompromisingly opposed to it, should seem to try to belittle the good done by it; why the official class of Englishmen should be treated, not as friends of the country and the people, whom they serve amid great difficulties and at great sacrifice; why the official class appear to be less in touch with the people than before, and less able to distinguish between opponents and enemies, between critics of their own acts and detractors of the Government, is an enquiry of the most vital importance for one competent enough to enter upon it."

Why does Mr. Karkaria not enter upon it, to the extent of a couple of pages? We have steadily pointed out "the most vital importance" of this question, and dealt with many of the outstanding causes and the obvious remedies. There is balm in Gilead, certainly. But who shall prevail on the political doctors to gather it and apply it? Not even, we venture to predict, Mr. Malabari.

THE KARAKORAM HIMALAYAS.

The Karakorams and Kashmir. An Account of a Journey. By OSCAR ECKENSTEIN. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1896.)

In the spring of 1892 Mr. Oscar Eckenstein set out with Sir William (then Professor) Conway, the Hon. C. J. Bruce and some others for an expedition in the Karakoram Himalayas. The object of the expedition was to make a survey of the country, geographical and geological. The results from a scientific point of view, were hardly satisfactory owing to the defective condition of some of the instruments. They have, however, been published by Sir W. Conway, and Mr. Eckenstein does not concern himself with them. The present volume is really a series of extracts from letters and a diary, put into a connected form, and there has been as little alteration as possible, lest they should lose their character of "an unsophisticated statement of actual impressions as they occurred." The interest of the book consists in the vivid accounts given from the point of view of an ardent mountain climber. On April 2nd the party reached Srinagar, and proceeded northwards. As is natural in an experienced Alpine climber, Mr. Eckenstein continually compares the Himalayas and the Alps. Speaking of the country near Bargil he says: "The scenery here exactly resembles the Swiss, but is on a larger scale. The native huts are built in the same way, of rough pine logs, the only difference being that the roof consists partially of bark instead of entirely of stone." Throughout the book the most striking fact is the immense scale of everything—the moraines for example, which take a day to cross (not an hour as in Switzerland) and the height and number of the peaks. Here is an account of a view in the Indus valley:

"A pleasant green patch surrounded by a wilderness of *débris*, with mountains on both sides almost entirely barren of vegetation, rising 8,000 to 10,000 feet above us. Up the valley one has a fine view of Rakipushi, a fine mountain over 25,000 feet high. To the south is the vast mountain mass called Digamar. The highest point is 26,620 feet high, and as we are here only some 4,000 feet above sea level, one actually looks up over 22,000 feet! I doubt whether there is any other place in the world where one can look up a similar height."

The skill of the guides varies very much in different districts. In some places they are ignorant of the mountain passes and unfit for any difficult climbing. In other places they compare very favourably with the best Swiss guides. At Askole Mr. Eckenstein stayed some time, and encouraged the natives by the offer of small prizes to show him their skill in climbing. From the point of view of boulder-climbing he concludes that "the best man I found would beat the best guide I have ever seen over any kind of rocks. For 'Platten' (smooth slabs) most natives would beat the best Swiss." This is very high testimony to the powers of the native climbers, but it only relates to a particular district. In many cases the writer remarks on the inefficiency of the native guides. The original programme of the expedition had included the ascent of the Baltoro glacier, but Mr. Eckenstein left the party before this was made, retraced his steps to Srinagar and there his diary, so far as it has been made public, ends. Some illustrations would have added greatly to the interest of the book, but the sketches made by the artist of the party have already been published. A good map of the district would have been a still more useful addition, especially as almost all existing maps of the country are far from adequate.

"OM!"

The Vedic Philosophy; or an Exposition of the Sacred and Mysterious Monosyllable "Aum." Being the *Mândukya* Upanishad Text with English Translation and Commentary, and an Introduction. By HAR NÂRÂYANA. (Bombay: Tatva-Vivechaka Press. 1895. Price Re. 1, 8 an.)

From the author's introduction, we learn that he belongs to the Ârya-Samâj. "Much praise," he tells us, "is due to Swâmi Dayânanda Saraswati," the founder of the sect, "whose teachings have, during the present age of Atheism and Materialism, roused once more the sleeping sons of Ârya-Varta to explore their Vedic mines of true knowledge." No wonder, for "it was indeed the Grand Swâmi who stopped the torrent which was hurling down the youths of Modern India to Atheistic views or to religious Samajas who do not acknowledge the revelation of the holy Veda." Still the Grand Swâmi had his limitations. He was not a Brahma Jnâni or an Âtamvit (knower of self). His philosophical thoughts did not even go "so far as those of Mr. Herbert Spencer have done." The Grand Swâmi must, after all, take a back seat. "Greater praise is due to Madame H. P. Blavatsky, who, though of

a foreign nation, did so much for the revival of Ancient Sanskrit Literature and Brahma-Vidyâ." Mr. Har Nârâyana advises his readers "to try and fit themselves for the study of Brahma-Vidya." In return, we venture to advise him to apply his mind to the teachings of the *Westminster Gazette* on the subject of Madame H. P. Blavatsky.

Mr. Har Nârâyana is "a lad of grace." He inscribes his studies to his "respected and virtuous father," and immediately offers salutations to his spiritual preceptor, through whose teaching "my ignorance of Self was removed, and conviction brought to my mind of the real nature of things." We like this marked respect paid to father and *guru*—the fate of the Grand Swâmi notwithstanding. Mr. Har Nârâyana rejects the Darwinian theory with some contempt; "for, if we were to accept this, we would be at a loss to trace the origin of human language and the possession of Divine knowledge, which are peculiar to mankind only, and which are not self-acquired, but can only be learnt from others." But, if our author will only think of it, Akbar's linguistic experiment can hardly be accepted as conclusive; and, on the whole, we would venture to advise him "to try and fit himself for the study" of Darwin, before he make any pronouncements on his Theory. As for Mr. Herbert Spencer:

"Mr. Herbert Spencer agrees with the Vedântists in holding that there is only one Reality underlying all phenomena; and *that all the phenomena being only Appearances of the Real Entity are true only in their relative nature*; but he differs in thinking that the Real Entity is Unknowable in its Ultimate Nonrelative nature."

Mr. Spencer, then, must be set right. We cannot reproduce the author's preliminary description of "the different modes and methods by which knowledge of things both objective and subjective is acquired," and thus the summary conclusion may be somewhat obscured:

"Having understood that there is only one Real Entity underlying all phenomena, one stands in need of a preceptor to know what that Entity is. The preceptor then initiates him into the mysterious science, by announcing the formula that 'Thou art that (Reality)'; and in consequence of this teaching, there arises a particular idea in the mind of the pupil, which he expresses by saying 'I am that (Reality).' This idea removes the ignorance of the Pramâtâ-Chaitanya,[1] which then knows itself as the reality, the knower of all—the self of all. In knowing this, the Pramâtâ-Chaitanya recognises itself as the knower and not as a known object; the object known being the idea that 'I am that (Reality)'."

Thus, "on acquiring the knowledge of Âtmâ (self), one comes to know that the Reality underlying all phenomena is his own *self* which is Indivisible, Finer than the Fine, Absolute, Infinite, Unchangeable, Self-conscious, and from which all the relative phenomenal world derives its existence." If Mr. Spencer is not hereby redeemed from the misery of ignorance, he now knows where to find a *guru*.

But to come to the sacred and mysterious monosyllable *Aum*. "Aum"—written also "Aung"—is a name, and a symbol, of Brahma. These three letters are shown by Mr. Har Nârâyana to be "the life of all articulate words." For the consonants, having no independent existence of their own, may stand aside; and "the number of all the vowels can be reduced only to A, U, and M or 'ng'." Further, "we have a belief and are conscious that each of the letters, as well as the word formed thereby, has an existence. . . . This state of existence is called in Sanskrit *sat* (Be-ness). . . . This abstract idea of Be-ness has no form or name, and is only realised by men of refined intellect. Hence it is said that the syllable 'Aum' is made up of four parts." So far good.

Now, "exactly like the four component parts of the word Aum, the Universe before us also consists of four parts":—

"The gross outwardly manifested world, perceived through the senses, is represented by the letter A. . . . . The subtle manifestation, hidden from the senses, and conceived by the mind only, is represented by the letter U. . . . The third is the unmanifested world, which constitutes the unknowable part, and which it is impossible to know before its manifestation, is represented by M. . . . . The qualities have no independent existence of their own, and exist only in some substance. Now we see that the qualities undergo change. . . . But the change always takes place in some substratum. It therefore follows that there is some substratum in which a change of the qualities takes place, and that this substratum is the entity [Be-ness], which is the holder as well as the sustainer of the qualities of the three descriptions noted above."

For these positions reference is made to the *Mândukya* Upanishad. A further analysis of the Universe "shows" that there are: (1) things that have existence, but "do not exhibit any external signs of vivid consciousness," as minerals; (2) things that have existence, and a "partially developed state of consciousness," as vegetables; (3) things that have existence, and "a comparatively more developed state of consciousness," as animals; and (4) things that have existence," and also a greatly developed state of consciousness, together with the enjoyment of blissfulness"—*i.e.*, the state "in which a person, endowed with consciousness, cognizes nothing, but only blissfulness, as, for instance, in sound sleep." Now to sum up:—

"The first two classes demonstrate greatly the abstract quality of Be-ness. The third class shows a preponderance of Be-ness as well as Consciousness, or the animating principle; and the fourth class shows at once the existence or Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness, all combined in one.

"Having seen that the things in the Universe consist of the quality of Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness only, we jump at once to the conclusion that its first cause, the Brahma, must necessarily consist of Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness. It is therefore said that Brahma is an embodiment of Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness."

It is not necessary to go into details. Mr. Har

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder

IS

"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer*."

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

[1] "The Atma (Reality), in conjunction with the mind and the senses, is called Pramâtâ-Chaitanya, or the Cognizor."

Nârâyana has given his reasons for the faith that is in him. He has brushed aside Darwin. He has read a lesson to Mr. Herbert Spencer. He has acquired Brahma Vidyâ. He has achieved the *regnum et diadema tutum.* May we add that he "cognises nothing, but only blissfulness"? A metaphysical Scotsman would say he has "a bee in his bonnet." The little book is symptomatic of much, and that is why we have been careful to set forth the author's mind in the matter. Such a mind—such an adult mind—is beyond the estimate of Western standards, yet it is largely typical. What Western philosopher would felicitate himself in such a balloon of gossamer in the vast inane? We macarize Mr. Har Nârâyana. But—let him stay in Jericho till his beard be grown.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

AUGUST, 1896.

GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Curzon, G. N., "Pamirs, and the source of the Oxus."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Dhingra, B. L., "Medical Aid for Indian Women." Waters, Surg.-Lieut.-Col., "Bombay the Beautiful." Rao, K. Srinivasa, B.A., "Englishmen in India."

MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE. "An Execution in India."

QUARTERLY REVIEW. "Our Indian Frontier."

TEMPLE BAR. Lawson, J., "A Day in Goa."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Perry-Marsh, T. A., "Our Young Soldiers in India." "The Indian Executive."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

AUGUST, 1896.

KARKARIA, R. P. ...."Pratapgad Fort and the Episode of Shivaji and Afzal Khan." (Poona: The *Arya-Bhusahna* Press; London: T. G. Johnson) .... — —

HULTZOCH, E., Ph.D. ...."Archæological Survey of India: South Indian Inscriptions." (Madras: The Superintendent Press, Rs. 4; London: Luzac and Co.)................ — —

BAHADURJI, K. N., M.D.........."The Anomalies and Evils of the Medical Administration of India." (A. Bonner) .... — —

HOPKINS, EDWARD WASHBURN ......"The Religions of India." (Edward Arnold) .... — —

BHATTACHARYA, JOGENDRA NATH, M.A., D.L..."Hindu Castes and Sects." .... — —

DEY, KANNY LALL RAI BAHADUR, C.I.E., F.C.S. "The Indigenous Drugs of India." (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co.) .... — —

SANYAL, RAM GOPAL.................."The Record of Criminal Cases as between Europeans and Natives, for the last 100 years." (Calcutta: Sanyal and Co.) .... Rs. 2

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION:—

HOME CIVIL SERVICE, THE ARMY, THE NAVY, THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA, etc. Rules and Regulations respecting Examinations for the. Corrected to 31st July, 1896.................. 1s. 0d.

HOUSE OF LORDS PAPERS:—

[172.] INDIA (EXPENSES OF TROOPS DESPATCHED TO AFRICA IN AID OF EGYPTIAN TROOPS)—Return of Opinions and Reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council .... 0s. 0½d.

[173.] INDIA (INDIAN TARIFF ACT AND THE COTTON DUTIES)—Return of Opinions and Reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council, with reference to the Despatch of 2nd April, 1896, to the Government of India .... 0s. 1½d.

[188.] INDIA (SIAM AND THE UPPER MEKONG)—Return of Letter from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, dated 6th May, 1896, on the subject of the Agreement with France respecting Siam and the Upper Mekong .... 0s. 0½d.

[189.] EAST INDIA (KAFIRISTAN), 1896—Correspondence relating to Afghan Proceedings in Kafiristan .... 0s. 2d.

HOUSE OF COMMONS PAPERS:—

[257.] EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA)—Return of, from the half year ended on 31st March, 1896.................................. 0s. 0½d.

[262.] EAST INDIA (KAFIRISTAN), 1896—Correspondence relating to Afghan Proceedings in Kafiristan .... 0s. 2d.

[263.] EAST INDIA (SIAM AND THE UPPER MEKONG)—Letter from the Government of India, to the Secretary of State, dated 6th May, 1896, on the subject of the Agreement with France respecting Siam and the Upper Mekong .... 0s. 0½d.

[327.] EAST INDIA (OFFICES OF PRESIDENCY MAGISTRATES AND JUDGE OF THE PRESIDENCY COURT OF SMALL CAUSES)—Return of Correspondence between the Government of India and Bombay and the Secretary of State for India on the subject of the Exemption of the Offices of Presidency Magistrate and Judge of the Presidency Court of Small Causes from the operation of the Rules relating to the Provincial Services .... — —

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

[C.—8,169.] EAST INDIA: ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1896-97.—Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India .... 0s. 5½d.

OUDH COMMERCIAL BANK, Ld.

FYZABAD, OUDH.

ESTABLISHED 1881.

CAPITAL—Rs. 2,00,000. RESERVE FUND, Rs. 65,000.

FIXED DEPOSITS are received as under:—

At 6 per cent. withdrawable 18 months after notice.
" 5½ " " 12 " " "

Banking business of every description transacted.

RAM SARAN DAS, M.A., F.A.U., M.A.S.B., *Manager.*

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.